The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1893.

The Week.

THE doorkeeper of the British House of Commons retired the other day after a service of thirty-seven years, and was succeeded by his first assistant. The place is a valuable one, both because of its salary, its permanence, and its dignity. Now, suppose Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Balfour, and all the other leaders on both sides of the House had, on hearing that the doorkeepership was vacant, laid aside the home-rule question, and the liquor question, and the parish councils, and the Uganda question, and engaged in a general "fight" over the appointment, and obstructed, and combined, and dickered, and intrigued week after week as to who should have the place, and tried to bargain that if A got it, D should be first assistant and C should be second, and that if Gladstone were allowed to "name" the head, Balfour should get the second place for his "man," and that Chamberlain and the Liberal Unionists should have at least two sweepers and dusters, and that the towel-washer should be the perquisite of the Nationalists, what should we here think of it? About the feelings of the British public we shall say nothing. But is there an intelligent man or woman in the United States who would not feel sorry and ashamed over the spectacle, and would not think that England was going, or rather had gone, to the dogs? If so, how is it that we have a standard of conduct for foreign legislators so much higher than we have for our own? How is it that we recently witnessed a display of childish neglect of public interests on the part of our own Senate, precisely similar to that we have pictured above on the part of British legislators, without more indignation? How is it we allow the attention of the President and Cabinet to be absorbed for months after an important election in settling the trumpery claims of a lot of shiftless people to a lot of small places, without more indignant remonstrance? What traveller from Mars, who saw nothing but the Executive of the United States Government during the month or two following a Presidential election, would suppose that there stood behind him a nation of particularly grave and serious business men, who allowed no playing or loafing in their offices, or factories, or farms in working hours, and always sought to pay their notes at maturity?

We are glad to learn that the State Department has on foot an investigation into the working of the various reciprocity agreements, and we can well believe the report that Secretary Gresham has already found that there is a good deal in reciprocity that is not reciprocal. It has long been known to houses doing business with Cuba and Porto Rico that the new tariff for those colonies was expressly designed to nullify certain advantages which American exporters thought they were to enjoy under the treaty. This was done by the very simple plan of putting such enormous duties on some articles that they remained practically prohibitory, and left the monopoly of the trade with Spain even after the agreed reduction of 25 or 50 per cent. had been made on American importations. Similar methods are said to have been followed, though to a less extent, in Brazil. But it is clear that the treaty with the latter country has been a disastrous failure, judged by the reasons given for negotiating it and the results which it was asserted the treaty would bring about. The great evil of our Brazilian trade, according to the Republican oracles of 1890, was that it left such a fearful balance against us—from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 yearly. This was intolerable. Brazil must be made to buy more goods of us and redress this adverse balance. Under the treaty this was all to be changed. As a matter of fact, however, in the first full year of the operation of the treaty, Brazil bought of us exactly $171,627 more goods than she had in the foregoing year, while she cruelly unloaded upon us $35,403,009 more of her own products. Instead of the adverse balance of $69,110,349 in 1891, we had one of $104,341,731 in 1892. If the Republicans were telling the truth in 1890, they must admit that their treaty with Brazil ought to be repealed at once, on the ground that it has made matters worse instead of better.

But the Administration has far better ground for reversing the action of President Harrison under the reciprocity clause of the McKinley Bill in imposing a tax upon the hides and coffee of Colombia and Venezuela and Hayti. That tax may slightly graze the heads of the people it was aimed at, but there is no doubt that it hits the American consumer full in the face. What damage it inflicts upon the other fellows is highly problematical, but it is certain that it is costing us $5,000,000 a year. More than that, the tax is not persuading the Colombians and the rest to change their minds in the least. Those naughty boys go on just as if their teacher was not rapping himself over the knuckles to bring them to their senses. They seem able to stand no end of that kind of vicarious suffering. We hope that the Administration will speedily see its way to repealing a tax which is not only burdensome, but utterly fruitless and absurd, as far as accomplishing what it was intended to is concerned.

The "Papers relating to the Annexation of the Hawaiian Islands" contain much curious reading. Probably the most remarkable thing in them is the confession of the Provisional Government that it was not a *de facto* government when the protectorate flag was raised by Mr. Stevens. Mr. Foster, writing to Mr. Stevens on the 28th of January in reply to the announcement of the revolution, said:

> "Your course in recognizing an unopposed *de-facto* government appears to have been discreet and in accordance with the facts. The rule of this Government has uniformly been to recognize and enter into relation with any actual government in full possession of effective power, with the assent of the people. You will continue to recognize the new Government under such conditions."

Mr. Foster need not have added the qualification "with the assent of the people." It is always proper to recognize a *de-facto* government, whether it has the assent of the people or not, provided it be "in full possession of actual power"; that is, power to maintain order, protect life and property, and make itself obeyed. On the 1st of February, however, two days after Mr. Foster's despatch was written, Mr. Stevens wrote to Capt. Wiltse of the *Boston* that he had heard from the Provisional Government that it was "unable to protect life and property and to prevent civil disorder" in Honolulu, and therefore it requested that "the flag of the United States might be raised for the protection of the Hawaiian Islands," and Mr. Stevens directed Capt. Wiltse to comply with this request. He enclosed the letter of the Provisional Government, which says: "Believing that we are unable to satisfactorily protect life and property and prevent civil disorders in Honolulu and throughout the Hawaiian Islands, we pray, etc., etc." So that the Government which Mr. Stevens recognized was not a *de-facto* government at all, or any other kind of government, and had, a few days after the recognition, to ask for armed protection from its enemies, at the hands of the United States Navy. This reminds one somewhat of the Irishman who said that "if it wasn't for the police, the Irish would rise and sweep the British garrison into the sea." A *de facto* government protected by foreign troops is a fraud on the Powers which recognize it, for the first essential of a *de-facto* government is ability to enforce its authority, at least in the city in which it sits.

The true inwardness of republican institutions in Hawaii is becoming every day more apparent. The newspaper correspondents think that Commissioner Blount's policy is deeply mysterious, but it is really simplicity itself. He is merely standing off and letting the experiment work itself out. If the Hawaiians are ever to come into the American Union, they must come in as a self-governing community. We have no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provisions for ruling a State or Territory by brute force. The very first thing to be done, therefore, in finding out whether the Hawaiians are capable of self-government, is to remove every kind and show of outside compulsion. This has now been done, and the result is, according to the desponding correspondent of the *Tribune*, that "President Dole has lost standing," and, worse still, "many whom he has alienated by refusing to give them office, have gone over to the Queen's party." Alienation on account of not getting office does, it is true, look as if republican institutions were in good working order, but to "go over to the Queen's party" is the work of a tyro in republicanism. What these disappointed Hawaiian patriots should have done was to prepare for vigorous "knifing," and take to gloomy prediction, and speak of President Dole's "ingratitude," and hint at perfect knowledge of those who had "poisoned" his mind. Such unsophisticated fellows as they have shown themselves to be would never be at home with our politicians.

The *Hawaiian Gazette* of April 4 puts the best face possible on the hauling down of the American flag on the preceding Saturday, but shows how little it believes its own assertion that the event "need alarm no one" by advising the Provisional Government to swear in the 2,000 members of the Annexation Club "as a military reserve." This would seem to confirm President Dole's admission that his Government was not able to protect life and property without the aid of the United States, and also that he is getting ready to set up that "republic" which he has frankly said would "necessarily be a government of force." The *Gazette* also shows its desperation by bringing out again the spectre of "English intrigues." In this it resembles the *Sun*, which is suffering fearfully nowadays from suppressed patriotism, and asks, "What will English possession of Hawaii mean to the United States?" But the question is, How is England going to get the Islands? As far as the latter are concerned, they are tied up by treaty with the United States never to cede a foot of territory to any other foreign Power, or to seek a protectorate; and as for England, she has bound herself by a solemn treaty with France, "never to take possession, either directly or under the title of a protectorate, or under any other form, of any part of the territory of which they [the Sandwich Islands] are composed." The English scarecrow is too obviously a thing of rags and sticks to frighten anybody but a professional patriot.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court a few days ago in the case of a Texas liquor-dealer who had challenged the validity of a law of that commonwealth, is of interest for its bearing upon the State-rights question. Liquor-dealers in Texas are not only taxed higher than other people, but are also required to pay their taxes sooner, while there are other discriminations against them. A dealer set up the claim that this legislation against his class was in violation of the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, which declares that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person the equal protection of the laws. The Court made short work of this claim. It pointed out that the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States spoken of in this amendment are privileges and immunities arising out of the nature and essential character of the National Government, and granted or secured by the Constitution; and declared that the right to sell intoxicants is not one of the rights growing out of such citizenship. While admitting that the fourteenth amendment forbids any arbitrary deprivation of life, liberty, or property, it held that it was not designed to interfere with the power of the State to protect the lives and property of its citizens and to promote their health and morals. Nor was the provision in regard to the equal protection of the laws intended to compel a State to adopt an iron rule of equality in regard to taxation, or to prevent the classification of property at different rates, so long as there is no discrimination in favor of one as against another person of the same class. As the statute in question affects all liquor-dealers in Texas alike, it is within the prerogative of the State.

The Musical Mutual Protective Union played its usual farce on Friday in trying to prevent the Imperial German infantry and cavalry bands from entering this country as artists, on the ground that they are not artists, but contract laborers. Their Secretary, Mr. Hunt, delivered himself of the extraordinary opinion that there were only three artists, as far as he knew—Paderewski, Patti, and Nikisch! It will be an astounding bit of news to the Germans to read of the examination as to their ability to play their instruments to which their imperial musicians were subjected on our immigrant island before they were permitted to enter this city. Can we wonder that the opinion is still widely prevalent in Germany that to hunt the buffalo one need only go to the suburbs of New York, and that Indian scalping raids are still frequent in Broadway? Dr. Senner, of course, decided that Emperor William's musicians are artists, and admitted them.

Every reputable citizen of New York must experience a feeling of humiliation as he reads the "reasons" which Gov. Flower gave to the citizens of Buffalo who asked him for a hearing in opposition to Mr. Sheehan's second bill depriving their Mayor of appointing powers which they had elected him to exercise. That such an announcement could be put forth publicly by the Governor of the first State in the Union, apparently without any consciousness of its undignified and disgraceful character, shows the level to which the Hill Machine has brought our public affairs. From one point of view we are glad that the Governor has taken this position. He is now stripped of all pretence of being any more decent than the Machine leaders who put him in nomination for office. No one can henceforth make any plausible claim that there are possibilities of useful or honorable public service in him. He has taken his stand squarely with Sheehan and the others of the Hill band of political pirates, and he will be judged hereafter on his merits. In all probability he has by his recent performances made certain his renomination next year, and we have hopes, somewhat uncertain, we must confess, that when he comes before the people for reëlection, the Democratic journals that are now denouncing him will not be "brought into line" again in his support.

Mr. Sulzer, the Tammany Speaker of the late Assembly, is a very silly young man, but it seems scarcely credible that he should have declared publicly on Monday night, as the *Tribune* reports him to have done, that "all legislation of the last session came from Tammany Hall and was dictated by that great statesman Richard Croker." That Mr. Sulzer says this privately, and that it is strictly true, we do not question for a moment; but great as the ex-Speaker's capacity for foolishness is, we find it difficult to believe that he could have given public utterance to such a confession of his own slavery and that of his fellow-members in the Legislature. From the time that Sulzer met Croker in the café of the Hoffman House, immediately after his election to the Speakership, and there arranged the committees of the Assembly, there was no serious question as to who was "running" the Assembly. The subsequent legislation confirmed the impression produced by that meeting. Croker did dictate everything. If any one had doubts about the matter, the fate of bills before the Legislature during the session would have removed it. Nothing that Croker desired to pass failed of passage, and nothing that he objected to was able to get even a hearing.

There was one notable peculiarity about the bills presented to the last Legislature which must have struck everybody who examined a file of them. We do not believe there has been a previous session of the Legislature for many years at which so few bills affecting railway and insurance companies were presented. The familiar "strikes" against such companies and corporations generally were scarcely seen at all. What was the reason for this? At Albany the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members themselves declared that the reason was to be found in the fact that the bosses were controlling everything this year, and that there was nothing in the business for the members themselves. How was this control established and what were the terms? We believe it is a fact also that the railway, insurance, and other companies kept no agents at Albany during the late session, and that they did not, as during previous sessions, find themselves obliged to send up counsel to oppose in committee the progress of legislation hostile to themselves. Had this unusual situation anything to do with the alleged claim of Mr. Sulzer that "all legislation of the last session came from Tammany Hall, and was dictated by that great statesman Richard Croker"? If so, what was the compensation, or inducement, which Mr. Croker received for his great services? We ask for information, and shall be glad to receive light from any quarter.

At the recent election in Michigan an amendment to the Constitution was submitted which proposed a new method of securing highway improvement. It seems to have been carried by a small majority, although the vote of the whole State must be known before the result can be definitely stated. The extraordinary feature of the division is the fact that the affirmative majorities came from the counties which contain Detroit and the other chief cities, while the negative majorities appear almost wholly in the most prosperous and intelligent farming communities, one such county giving a negative majority of 1,014. If the new system for securing good roads throughout the rural districts is adopted, therefore, it will be only by the votes of city people, a very small percentage of whom ever use such roads. In other words, the farmers, who are most interested in the improvement, are the last to appreciate its importance.

The new system of a qualified suffrage in Mississippi is producing some results which were not anticipated when the new Constitution was adopted. The change was made primarily to prevent a minority of intelligent whites from being subject to the political rule of a majority of ignorant blacks; but as the system appears to be applied with reasonable fairness, it is relieving the community from the dominance of the worst elements among the whites as well. The ignorant and shiftless elements in both races fail to qualify themselves as voters, and thereby lose their former power to settle various questions of local administration. The change is most marked in the treatment of the liquor question. Mississippi has long had a local-option system, but under the old Constitution the saloon party was apt to get a majority in a county where the respectable people of both races were against license, through its control of the ignorant and irresponsible voters. Now these men are not qualified to exercise the suffrage, and seven counties which had formerly been "wet" have gone "dry" during the last twelve months, because the majority of those who now possess the ballot are opposed to saloons. The change is felt in the cities as well as in the rural districts, and Meridian and Columbus, the two largest and most prosperous cities in the eastern portion of the State, have lately gone "dry" because the saloon men could not secure the signatures of a majority of the registered voters to their petitions for renewal, as the law requires.

The recent commencement exercises of the Law Department of Shaw University at Raleigh, N. C., merit attention for the evidence which they furnished of the better feeling between the two races. The University is an institution for the education of colored youth, but many of the most prominent whites in the capital were among the audience on this occasion. The annual address was delivered by James C. MacRae, a Democratic lawyer who was elected a judge of the Supreme Court last fall; and George H. Snow, another leading lawyer and an ex-member of the State Senate, was on the programme for an address. In the latter's absence, Maj. E. G. Harrell, who is on the staff of the Democratic Governor, was called upon, and responded by saying that, "if there was any school in North Carolina that was doing more good than any other, it was Shaw University; that he met its graduates in various parts of the State, and they were doing a great and grand work which was reflecting high honor upon the University and its friends." This is a very different attitude from that occupied by the representative whites of Raleigh and North Carolina when the University was established, which was that of suspicion, if not open hostility, and the change is a notable sign of progress.

Gen. Weaver has never made a more statesmanlike proposition than the one he put forward on Monday, for the establishment of an "independent school of political science." As he justly observes, those who now "control the colleges and universities of the country" are "adversaries of human liberty," and hence it becomes necessary to have a place where political science can be taught in a way that is not only free, but free and easy. Seven professors could do the work, he believes, and he marks out the different departments in which they would disport themselves. One of them is to be "applied Christianity," which all will admit is excellent if we only know who is going to apply it. The department of "constitutional legislation" is significant of much, from the Populist point of view, and we should expect to see the occupant of this chair imitate the French judge who said it was necessary to twist the law so that he could have a proper respect for it. We think the General should have given a separate department to "patriotism," which is one of the most important divisions of political science, and urgently calls for exposition in these days when it is so important to know which precious metal and what kind of paper money are truly patriotic, how much better terms at a note-broker's a firm patriot can get than one who is a little shaky, and so on. But Gen. Weaver's plan as it is is most praiseworthy. It would be hard to name a public want more imperative than that of getting men into professors' chairs to give a rational account of Populist ideas. Gen. Weaver's seven men that can render a reason, with himself as director of them all, which he offers to be "without salary," would speedily depopulate the lecture-rooms of Vienna and Berlin.

It is said that a Dundee whaling vessel has returned from the Antarctic Ocean with sixty thousand sealskins, and that the captain refuses to tell where he obtained them. This accounts for the scarcity of seals in Bering Sea lately. They left the islands of St. Paul and St. George *animo revertendi*, but they were driven out of those waters by poachers and continued their march to the south, where they were slaughtered by this Dundee whaler. Now, ought not this matter to be brought before the Paris Court of Arbitration? The fact that the Dundee skipper refuses to tell where he found these seals is a suspicious circumstance anyhow. *Prima facie*, all seals found without an owner belong to Uncle Sam. He is the great keeper of the seal.

The great interest taken a few years ago in Père Hyacinthe by the Protestants of this country and England, as well as by those of France, has mostly expired with the lapse of time. It long ago became evident that he was not going to lead any considerable defection from the Catholic Church, and that his somewhat fantastic attempt to restore the "Gallican liberties" in France was doomed to settle down into an isolated and dwindling congregation held together for a time by his personality. Now comes the announcement that he has cast in his lot with the Old Catholics. On Palm Sunday he informed his audience that "the Bishops of the Catholic Church of the Low Countries have decided to take this work under their jurisdiction." Father Hyacinthe expressed great satisfaction at thus being incorporated with an ecclesiastical body in which the episcopal succession has been maintained, and through which he would be brought into relation with the Old Catholics of Germany and Switzerland. He thought the result would be to give a new impulse as well as durability to his work in Paris. However that may be, the end of his experiment in independence comes to show afresh that the age of sect-making has gone.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GOVERNMENT'S CREDIT.

THE statement given to the press by President Cleveland, saying that there never was any intention on the part of the Government to refuse gold in the redemption of Treasury notes, and that the public credit will be maintained at all hazards, is all that could be desired, and is the only thing needed, so far as the Executive is concerned, to assure business stability and prosperity. That priceless legacy, the Government's credit, which has come down to us unimpaired, will be passed on to the next generation without spot or blemish.

Let us take a glance at the Government's credit in the past. During the war, and after the suspension of specie payments, certain old loans fell due, among them one known as the Oregon war debt, and the question was raised whether they were not payable in greenbacks. These bits of paper were legal tender for all debts, public and private, except duties on imports and *interest* on the public debt. Interest is not principal, said some people, therefore the principal of these debts is payable in greenbacks. Not so, said Secretary Chase. The greenback itself is a debt. To pay greenbacks for maturing bonds without the consent of the holder is to offer him one form of Government debt for another. That would be repudiation to the extent of the difference in value between greenbacks and gold. Moreover, continued Mr. Chase in closing the debate, I am Secretary of the Treasury and you are not; all maturing loans will be paid in gold. And so they were paid.

Nothing did more to support the Government's credit during that trying period than Secretary Chase's decision to pay the Oregon war debt in gold. There were not wanting, even then, demagogues to cry out against the injustice of paying better money to bondholders than to soldiers, but their cries were unheeded. The Secretary, perhaps, made some mistakes in his financial policy, but upon this fundamental point he was both clear in judgment and firm in principle. He was establishing a precedent. He was protecting the country's credit. He was laying a foundation for such loans as he and his successors in office might need in time to come, down to the latest hour of the republic. We all owe Mr. Chase a debt for that.

We need not recount the greenback controversies that supervened after the close of the war. Although during a considerable period the Government suspended payment on its notes, it did eventually redeem them in gold, and so it continues to do. All of its maturing bonds and all the interest on its bonds have been paid in gold. Its greenbacks, its Treasury notes, its silver certificates, and every other obligation have been and are to-day redeemable in gold. There is not now a blemish on the national credit. Foolishness there is in the financial legislation of the country, but not a blot on its 'scutcheon. How proud we all ought to be that we can say this with truth.

There were a few hours last Friday when it seemed possible that this untarnished record might be soiled. It was reported from Washington that the Secretary of the Treasury doubted his legal power to apply any portion of the $100,000,000 gold reserve to the redemption of Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890. When the test came, however, it was found that he did redeem out of that reserve every Treasury note presented for redemption, So all doubts were solved by an experiment. The precedent established by Secretary Chase, that all maturing Government obligations are payable in gold, is unbroken and will remain so.

Under any circumstances the credit of individuals is much tied up with the Government's credit, but under present circumstances the two are so involved that they must stand or fall together. In one way and another, most unwisely as we think, the Treasury has become the United States Bank, with far greater powers and responsibilities than either of the old banks of the United States ever had. The Treasury issues all the money we use except a mere bagatelle ($130,000,000) of national-bank notes. It holds the ultimate coin reserve of the nation. It maintains the standard of value. What is done in this behalf by the Bank of England and the Bank of France in those countries respectively is done here by the Treasury Department. This is unfortunate. It is most unfortunate that such responsibilities should rest with the political power when they have no political character whatever. Such responsibilities are of a business sort only, and they should rest with business men solely. By this we mean not that the Secretary of the Treasury should be a business man necessarily, but that the entire function of regulating and maintaining the standard of value should be lodged in the business world and not in the political world. The only proper function of the Treasury Department is to collect the taxes and pay the dues of the Government. Some incidental duties, such as the light-house and life-saving service and the care of public buildings, may properly enough be put upon it for want of a better place, but to charge it with the functions of legal-tender and currency and an overshadowing bank is unscientific in the last degree.

But since things are as they are, since the Treasury is so interwoven with private business that every tremor in its framework is projected along the nerves of the whole community, it is all the more necessary that the Government's credit should continue to be, like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. President Cleveland's statement of intentions gives assurance that it will so continue. The assurance is absolute because the means in his hands are ample. With the Government's credit unimpaired, he can draw gold from every chest in Europe, but if that credit had been stabbed by a refusal to redeem Treasury notes in gold, the money markets of both America and Europe would have been closed against us. It follows from what Mr. Cleveland has said that he will issue bonds whenever it becomes necessary in order to replenish his stock of gold. But sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

NEWSPAPER PICTURES.

HARPER'S WEEKLY, a highly respectable authority on matters of periodical art, lately gave its approval to "cuts in the columns of the daily newspapers," and added:

> "There is no more reason why the reader should not receive accurate information or pleasing or satisfying impressions through the fruits of the engraver's art than there is why he should not be given in legible type the printed matter that is suited to his needs and tastes."

If the readers of our morning contemporaries which have gone into the "cut" business really "receive accurate information or pleasing or satisfying impressions" through the fruits of the engraver's art now furnished us every morning, it shows that the "printed matter" has done the work which many observers have long feared it was doing among the newspaper readers of this city. The "printed matter" of some of them has for a good while been doing all that printed matter can do to reduce the popular intelligence to that early stage which makes the life of nursery governesses and mistresses of kindergartens so hard, in which all the resources of pedagogy have to be exhausted to keep the child's attention fixed on anything. In the first attempts to get him to read, as every teacher of infants knows, pictures are a powerful help in explaining the combinations of letters which make up words. Who among us has not been indebted greatly to "cuts" in making his first intelligent acquaintance with "printed matter"? What a light, for instance, was thrown on the uses of the letter A by the little picture reproducing the Ass that Eat the Hay; on B by the Bull that Tossed the Man; on C by the Cat that Killed the Mouse; on D by the Dog that Barked at the Goose.

Children of an older growth are in like manner immensely aided in grasping the leading facts of such an incident as the Craven wedding, for example, by appropriate illustrations. One paper devoted a column or two to the question whether the bride's wedding dress had paid duty, and maintained that if it had not paid duty because already worn, it showed that she was to be married in a "soiled gown." But this contention—long and ably argued—was necessarily confused by the cross issue, whether the bridegroom was really tattooed, as was represented by some rival sheets. The refusal of the bridegroom to answer categorically on this point led to the consultation of all the local ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perts touching the attitude of the British nobility towards the practice of tattooing, but their opinions were conflicting. The perusal of the pros and cons of these matters naturally confused even the brightest minds among our newspaper readers. The printed matter having done what it could for them, the pictures were brought into play and lighted up the whole subject. The great question of cabmen's beards also might have been discussed indefinitely in the text without the thorough elucidation given by a picture of a cabman with a beard, of a shaven cabman, and of two or three cabmen prominent in the agitation. In like manner, how could any of us who were not there have ever got a clear idea of what the reception at the Hotel Waldorf was like without a picture of six or seven women three-quarters' length, three men full-length, and eight or ten blurred heads, male and female—all done nicely in bad printer's ink by a Hoe press?

The solemn truth is, that the printed matter of some of our metropolitan dailies has now for a dozen years been making it impossible for the people of this city to read anything very long on any subject, or read anything, long or short, on any serious subject. The young people who leave the public schools with reading and little else, make the newspaper their only literature. After they have been stuffed for a few years with the comic view of every institution, from Christianity down, and with burlesque reports of meetings, with bogus interviews with all public men, in which they are made to appear either knaves or fools, with accounts columns long of how one man hit another in the stomach, and how the other man objected, and how the names of the Park animals were changed, and how Johnny Malone jilted the widow Jones, and how the hackmen feel about beards, and how a red-faced man pursued a small man with a knife, the children get tired, and have to have their jaded attention roused by something which will not need to be followed with the eye like printed lines.

No one who has observed New York journalism for the last few years could fail to perceive that pictures had to come sooner or later. The childish view of the world is, so to speak, "on top." The youth does not want to read about Bering Sea, and is satisfied with a picture of Mr. Carter. He would like to know something about the disturbances in Brussels, and is satisfied with a picture of the King's palace. He does not care to look into the merits of the Webster Bill, and is content with a picture of some of the nuisances on the Croton River. As to the Hawaiian trouble, he makes up his mind by means of a "cut" of the American flag floating on the Government buildings, and feels sure that nobody but a bad American would "haul down" anything so pretty. But newspaper proprietors who think they have finally solved the problem of sensational journalism by seasoning the printed matter with "cuts," make, we are sure, a great mistake. Cuts will pall before long, as reporter's burlesque and Tom-and-Jerry philosophy have palled. The "cuts" will in their turn have to be supplemented by something more infantile still. The reader will demand and have to get a rattle, or a colored India-rubber balloon, or a bright ball of worsted, or a jack-in-the-box, with each year's subscription. The monopoly of *Babyhood* is nearly over.

CORPORATION STOCK-WATERING.

THE question of stock-watering is perennial in Massachusetts, principally for the reason that the railroads of that State were built through subscriptions to the capital stock and not by bonds, as is the modern fashion. Hence the increase in values which on Western roads is represented by an advance towards the par of the stock (which at first cost nothing) is registered in Massachusetts by an increase much above par. This quotation above par gives an opportunity to the railway of watering its capital by issuing to present holders new stock at par which can be sold immediately at a large advance. Around the bill before the Massachusetts General Court to prevent such sales the fight against watering has centred. Last week the State Board of Trade held a meeting at which ex-Railroad Commissioner George G. Crocker delivered an address. Since all seemed to agree with the speaker, he may be supposed to represent the business interests of Massachusetts.

The general subject has been so often discussed that it is unnecessary to go over the whole ground further than to say that stock and bond-watering has given rise to evils which should be restrained if this can be done without doing more harm than good. But if anything of the sort is to be attempted, it is well to clear the ground by asserting that nothing can be gained by arguments so sweeping as to defeat their purpose; and this is the defect of Mr. Crocker's reasoning and that of all who think with him. Shakspere's phrase, "there is some soul of goodness in things evil," is as applicable to commerce as to morals, and the best course in discussing this business problem is to ask one's self why, in spite of much denunciation and innumerable statutes, corporate stock-watering is still persisted in. We may be sure, from the constant instances we hear of, that there is some business principle at the bottom which is asserting itself, even though we may be hostile to the form which it publicly assumes.

When a dry-goods partnership is successful, each partner obtains his due share of the accumulated profits. No legal machinery is necessary to accomplish this result, and no one complains because the firm has grown wealthy in legitimate trade. For well-known reasons suppose that a dry-goods house turn themselves into a corporation, and issue stock in amount equal to the value of the business as it is at the time of incorporation—not as it was when they started as a firm. We will assume that their success still continues, and in a few years the value of the corporation assets is doubled. When the firm's property doubled there was no occasion for any difficulty, but the corporate form has changed the position. If we followed the practice of the first partnership, we should double the stock, for undeniably the best theory of corporation finance requires that the share capital should stand at or near par. But, while doubling the partnership value is legitimate, doubling the shares of the corporation without payment for them is "watering." Stock-watering, then, in its innocent form may be defined as an attempt to make the nominal capitalization of a corporation conform to the real value of the property and assets. As thus stated, the business reason for watering is good, yet the principle in practice has been subject to much abuse—to the loss of the investor, however, oftener than of the consumer.

Mr. Crocker, in his address, laid down one or two axioms about "water." He said "the amount of stock and debt outstanding should be a basis for estimating what charges such corporations should fairly be allowed to make for services rendered," referring to all corporations having public duties, such as railways, gas companies, and the like. This assertion is only partly true. The possibility of greater profit is essential to progress. What business corporation will strive to perfect its process or invent new machinery if all the saving is to go to the public in the shape of a reduction of fares or prices? It is truer to say that the interests of corporation and customer are reciprocal. If the public could buy its hats or shoes at half our present prices, it ought to be willing that the enterprising corporation introducing the improvement should make large profits at the same time, even if it trebled its stock. And while a railway is not the same as a manufacturer, we cannot afford to ignore the point altogether. Farrer, in his book 'The State in relation to Trade,' gives instances where gas companies in England were allowed to pay higher dividends in proportion as they reduced the price of gas. It would be easy to show that the local (station to station) rates of the Fitchburg Railroad are double those of the Boston and Albany; a resident along the former road might well agree that the Fitchburg should be allowed to increase its capital indefinitely if only his charges fell in inverse proportion. Now, if we prevent the Fitchburg or any railway under any circumstances from stock watering—*i. e.*, giving a share of increasing profits to its stockholders—we may postpone the resident's hopes for lower freights; for in the long run the two things influence each other. Then, too, what becomes of Mr. Crocker's contention in the face of the fact, brought out in the statistics of the Inter-State Commerce Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mission, that the groups of railways having the largest capitalization per mile have also the lowest average tariffs?

If, then, we assume that corporations must be given the chance to make better profits in order that the public may have better service or lower prices, how should those increases in profits be registered? As we saw in the case of the dry-goods house, the corporate form does not lend itself easily to this registering. The trouble mainly springs from the wholly wrong idea often entertained that the ruling rate of interest for borrowed money should be the measure of a corporation's dividends. It is to conform the rate of the dividend to 4 or 5 per cent. that the amount of the corporation's stock is increased. But this interest rate has nothing to do with the question of profits. The percentage paid for money borrowed on good collateral bears no relation to the percentage of profit to which a partner in an enterprise is entitled who assumes all the risks. If the original projectors of or investors in our elevated railway system had been in any way limited to a return of only 5 per cent. on their money, that system would not have been built. These men demand—and rightly—a profit commensurate with their risk of loss in going into a costly experiment. As public opinion would not allow of high dividends, the stock had to be watered, while at the same time the present fare is only 5 cents for all hours and for any distance. Would it really have been a commercial sin if, concurrently with a reduction in fares, the dividend had been increased say to 12 per cent. without water?

There is, of course, possible abuse in corporation stock-watering, a discussion of the remedies for which is always in order. But no true understanding of our commercial conditions can be had, and no true relief devised, so long as would-be reformers take the extreme ground that all attempts on the part of corporations to pay high dividends, or to adjust capital and profits, are wrongs against the State.

PADEREWSKI AND LISZT.

THE question of nationality plays a curious rôle in the history of pianoforte playing. For a long time most of the great pianoforte composers and players—the Bachs, Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Schumann—were Germans. But with Schumann the list of Germans great in this department practically came to an end (unless we except Bülow and Brahms), and the field was left open for Slavic and Hungarian competitors. Russia gave us Rubinstein and Pachmann; Hungary, Liszt and Joseffy; Scotland, D'Albert; but the land preëminent for pianists is Poland. Chopin was a Pole, and so was the brilliant young Tausig, who, had he not died at the age of thirty, would, in the opinion of his pupil, Mr. Joseffy, and many others, have surpassed even his master, Liszt. Rubinstein, too, was half a Pole by descent. Little Josef Hoffman is a Pole, and now, to cap the climax, Mr. Paderewski has appeared; so that musically speaking, at any rate, it is safe to say, "Noch ist Polen nicht verloren."

Poland will some day honor Paderewski as it now honors Chopin; but in order to win the great fame and wealth which have fallen to his lot at the early age of thirty-two, he was of course obliged, like Chopin, to leave his native country and seek the great musical centres of the world. Three years ago he played in London to a $50 audience. To-day he often makes $5,000 in two hours, with $7,000 for the high-water mark. This profitableness of his art is a phenomenon worth mentioning, because he never resorts to claptrap, trickiness, or sensationalism in order to win success and applause. In this respect he is superior to Liszt, who, in his early period, did sometimes resort to sensationalism, which, however, was less a sign of immature taste than the wild exuberance of technical mastery bent on a frolic, and therefore not to be judged more severely than young Mozart's feat of playing on a piano the keys of which were covered with a cloth. The conditions in those days were not the same as at present. How eager the world was for Liszt's show pieces may be inferred from the fact that when, in the pressure of concert-giving and travelling, he sometimes kept his operatic arrangements in his head a few months before writing them down, the publishers pursued him from town to town urging him to put them into shape for the printer.

To offset this early sensationalism, Liszt did more than any other musician to popularize the best music by playing his later splendid and thoroughly artistic arrangements all over Europe. To us it seems strange that he should have played Beethoven's symphonies on the piano at Viennese concerts; but the truth is that the orchestras and conductors of that time were unable to interpret those symphonies satisfactorily, and many persons exclaimed, after hearing Liszt's inspired performance, that now for the first time was Beethoven's genius fully revealed to them. Mr. Paderewski would never imitate Liszt's example of playing a Beethoven symphony on the piano, for the simple reason that such a thing is no longer necessary. Our instrumentalists have improved immeasurably since the time—not much more than half a century ago—when the leading orchestra in Vienna put aside Schubert's ninth symphony as too difficult to be played. But Mr. Paderewski does play, and most properly, Liszt's superb arrangements of songs and operatic melodies. Schumann once said of Thalberg that he had the gift of dressing up commonplace ideas in such a way as to make them interesting. Liszt had the higher gift of taking the ideas of the greatest composers and transcribing them for the piano in such a way as to make them even superior to the original. Thus he succeeded in doing with music what no poet has ever succeeded in doing with poetry,—translate it successfully into another language. His happiest translations were the Magyar melodies, with their Asiatic gypsy ornaments, which he welded into his Hungarian rhapsodies for the delight of all whose musical enjoyment does not consist in the pedantic analyzing of sonatas, but who take pleasure in the spontaneous melodies in which the naïve populace, in its moments of poetic emotion, has embodied its joys and sorrows. Mr. Paderewski has revealed to us the true spirit of this delightful Hungarian folk-music as no pianist or gypsy band has ever done.

Liszt had the mocking-bird gift of imitating the style of all the great pianists, and generally surpassed them on their own ground. Mr. Paderewski has inherited this trait, as well as Liszt's amazing and unobtrusive technique and the art of getting orchestral effects from the piano, while in the magic of producing exquisite tone colors he even surpasses Liszt. In regard to their early career these great pianists present a considerable contrast. Mr. Paderewski was almost thirty before he won universal fame, while Liszt was the pet of all Europe as a boy. At nine, if he was asked to play a Bach fugue, he would boldly ask, "In what key?" At sixteen he had earned $20,000. But at present Mr. Paderewski is undergoing the same experiences that Liszt did, in the way of artistic, pecuniary, and social successes. That some foolish persons participate in the new "cult" is not his fault, nor is it gallant or just to sneer at it as a feminine fad. Were it not for the women, music in America and England would soon come to an end. Wagner understood this when he wrote: "With women's hearts it has always gone well with my art; and probably because, amid the prevailing vulgarity, it is always most difficult for women to let their souls become as thoroughly hardened as has been so completely the case with our political menfolk."

In local musical annals the season of 1892–1893 will go down as the Paderewski year. The Polish pianist will take his farewell of New York next Saturday, not to be heard again for several years, as he intends to devote his time to composition. No doubt it is more important for the cause of music that he should do so than that he should continue playing; yet it would be an incalculable loss if he should present one more parallel to Liszt by abandoning public playing altogether while he is the greatest living interpreter of the genius of the great masters. It is to be hoped that he will combine the functions of composer and pianist, giving concerts when his brain needs time for the maturing of new ideas.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIRGINIAN VOTING IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD (1744–1774).

PROVIDENCE, April 12, 1893.

To the Northern mind, the standing puzzle of Southern history is the existence, side by side, of aristocratic social institutions and democratic political theories. We admit the presence of both. As for the former, we easily perceive the causes, and see that they must have existed from the beginning. With respect to the latter, we feel ourselves to be on less certain ground. One of the most important and interesting problems confronting any one who approaches the history of Virginia in the times before the Revolution is that of the origin of Virginian democracy. We do not certainly know either when or why it came into existence. The prevailing assumption is, that it was the invention of Thomas Jefferson, or at least that it was the product of the Revolutionary movement. I do not believe that this is the true theory. To prove, or even to formulate, any other theory, would require a long-continued inquiry. In the present writing nothing more is attempted than to make a slight contribution to the investigation of the question.

It may be of some service towards this end if a partial answer is given to the question, to what extent Virginian politics had already become democratic in the period just preceding the outbreak of the Revolution. The mode by which I shall hope to cast a little light on this subordinate question is by the inquiry whether, in the last generation of the colonial period in Virginia, the years between 1744 and 1774, the exercise of the right of suffrage was in practice confined to the few. Did the Virginians of that period vote? Did they, for instance, vote in as large numbers proportionally as did the men of Massachusetts, which we know to have been highly democratic? At any rate we know that Massachusetts in the years from 1778 on was highly democratic, and it is these years, rather than those of the period preceding the Revolution, for which we have satisfactory data concerning voting in Massachusetts, and which we shall make the basis of our comparison. I have shown elsewhere (*New England Magazine*, January, 1890), that in the votes upon constitutions in 1778, 1779, and 1780, the total vote cast in Massachusetts amounted to but about 5 per cent. of the population, though it is probable that about 16 per cent. possessed the franchise; that in the voting for Governor in 1780 about 3 per cent. of the population participated, in the next six years about 2 per cent.; that Shays's Rebellion and the discussions respecting the Federal Constitution brought the figure up to 5 per cent. in the next three elections; and that then it sank to between 3 and 4, and there remained until 1794 and the disputes engendered by the French Revolution.

How many inhabitants of colonial Virginia could vote, it is impossible to say. At the opening of the period chosen, the qualifications of an elector in a county were those prescribed by the act of August, 1736, namely, "an estate of freehold, or other greater estate, in one hundred acres of land, at least, if no settlement be made upon it; or twenty-five acres with a house and plantation," in the county where he was proposing to vote. So far as the comparison can be made, it would appear that the Virginian qualification in real estate was somewhat higher than that established in Massachusetts. Moreover, the addition of a possible qualification in personal property in Massachusetts gave the suffrage to a certain number of the landless, especially to adult sons of freeholders who were not themselves freeholders. In 1762 the Virginia qualification in unimproved land was reduced from one hundred acres to fifty, that in improved land remaining still at twenty-five. The election law of 1769 effected no change in these respects.

But how many of the inhabitants of the Virginian counties actually voted? Statistics are available for certain counties only, and for only a few of the elections to the House of Burgesses. In a few county court-houses the figures have been preserved, and I have taken pains, by inspection or correspondence, to obtain these. The reports of contested-election cases in the Journals of the House of Burgesses contain a few others, and a few have been obtained from certain materials published in Mr. Ford's edition of Washington's writings.

First in the order of time comes a vote in Fairfax County in 1744, which the clerk of Fairfax has lately sent me. But leaving that for the present, I take up, first of all, certain votes in Spottsylvania and Westmoreland Counties. The records of a contested-election case in Spottsylvania in 1748, as given in the Journal of the House of Burgesses, show that the sitting members, William Waller and Rice Curtis, had received at the recent election 188 and 137 votes respectively, and that the petitioner or contestant, Benjamin Grymes, had received 60. He declares that more were coming in a wagon, ready to vote for him, at the time when the sheriff closed the polls, but we can make no allowance for these. The total of 385 is of course to be divided by two, since each voter had the right to vote for two candidates. As probably some did not, it is obvious that at least 193 of the freeholders of Spottsylvania voted at this election of 1748. Now we do not know the white population of Spottsylvania County at this time (white population is of course alone to be reckoned), but we do know the number of its white tithables. White tithables included, according to the act of 1705 (and the act of this same session of 1748 repeated the same definition), all white males of sixteen and upwards. Of such, Spottsylvania in 1756 had 665, as we learn from a return which Governor Dinwiddie sent to the Lords of Trade in that year. How large a population does this imply? In Massachusetts of the present day, according to the census of 1885, the males of sixteen and more years constituted about one-third of the population. The proportion of such persons is considerably greater in these days of greater longevity, diminished infant mortality, and smaller families. The population of a Virginian county a hundred and forty years ago was probably considerably more than three times as great as its number of tithables. Governor Dinwiddie computed it at four times as great. Comparison of the white tithables of 1790, 1800, and 1810, as given in document 31 of the appendix to the Journal of the Virginian Convention of 1829–30, with the white population of those years, shows the latter 4.1 times the former. Suppose, then, that Spottsylvania had a white population of 2,500. We have seen that in the election of 1748 she cast a vote of at least 193. This is a vote of presumably more than seven per cent. of the population. That would be a light vote in these days—in the census year of 1880 eighteen per cent. of our population voted; but, after every deduction, the figure is one which much surpasses that found for democratic Massachusetts in the years immediately after the close of the Revolution.

To turn to other instances. In the old court-house of Westmoreland County I was so fortunate as to discover the statements of the polling at four elections for the House of Burgesses, namely, in 1748, in 1752, in 1754, and in 1755. In 1748 there were 294 votes cast for John Bushrod and 233 for George Lee, from which it may be inferred that 264 men voted. In 1752 there were 262 votes cast for John Bushrod, 207 for Robert Vaulx, apparently 163 for Richard Lee ("Squire Lee"), and 34 for Robert Carter ("Councillor Carter"). The voters then numbered at least 333. In 1754 194 voted for Col. Augustine Washington (to be distinguished from the General's father), and 130 for Richard Lee, and there would appear to have been 162 voting. In 1755 there would appear to have been at least 338, for 186 votes were cast for Col. Augustine Washington, 183 for Philip Ludwell Lee, 168 for Richard Lee, and 138 for William Bernard. Now Dinwiddie's return of the next year, 1756, credits Westmoreland County with 944 white tithables, and it may therefore be presumed to have had a population of not more than 3,700 white inhabitants.

Another series of recorded votes comes to us from those occasions on which Washington himself stood for the House of Burgesses. The first such occasion seems to have been one of which our record is undated, occurring in Frederick County. The record is from a poll-list of voters in that county, found among his papers. It shows 271 votes for Hugh West and 270 for Thomas Swearingen, while Washington himself was vouchsafed but 40. This must have been in 1757, in which year the Virginia Almanac shows Frederick represented by West and Swearingen. Next year the county triumphantly elected Washington, the poll standing: Washington 307, Col. Martin 240, Hugh West 199, and Capt. Swearingen 45. It appears that 396 men voted. In 1761 their number rose to 600, for 505 votes were cast for Col. Washington, 400 for Col. George Mercer, and 294 for Col. Adam Stephens. Dinwiddie's contemporary list assigns to Frederick 2,173 white tithables, representing probably a population of 8,000. In the next two elections Washington stood for the county of Fairfax, the county in which Mt. Vernon was situated. (The Fairfax return already mentioned shows 239 freeholders voting in 1744.) In 1765, he writes to Col. Burwell Bassett: "I changed the scene from Frederick to this county, and had an easy and creditable poll." He received 201 votes, 148 going to one competitor and 131 to another. In 1768 the total vote was a little smaller. He then received 185 votes, the same competitors obtaining respectively 142 and 87. He records in his diary: "Went to the Election of Burgesses for this County and was there with Colo. West, chosen. Stayd all Night to a Ball wch. I had given." The average of the two occasions seems to give 224 voters, though, according to the Governor's return of ten years before, there were in the county 1,372 white tithables and presumably 5,000 inhabitants. But the General's own statement indicates that the vote was unusually light.

The next case for which I have figures is that of the election of 1769 in Fauquier County, a case in which Thomas H. Harrison contested the seats of Col. Thomas Marshall, father of the great Chief Justice, and of James Scott, because Marshall, being Sheriff of Farquier up to September 2, had appointed September 18 as the day for the election, and this, since that was also the day of election in Stafford, had prevented some electors from coming thence. The case occurs in the Journals of the House of Burgesses. It was held that, though

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Col. Marshall had acted improperly in so doing, the number thus virtually excluded was not enough to alter the vote, which stood: Marshall 329, Scott 273, Harrison 196. Apparently, therefore, 399 freeholders of Fauquier voted on this occasion. Unfortunately, the population of Fauquier at this time is omitted in Dinwiddie's return as printed. If it bore the same proportion to that of all Virginia in 1769 which it did in 1790, the number would have been a little over four thousand.

The last case in which I have found figures quoted is a case in Surry in 1772, where about 240 voted in a population which must have been by that time about 2,500. Summing up all the cases, thirteen in number, we find that, if they are to be taken as a fair guide, about 6 per cent. of the white inhabitants of colonial Virginia voted at the elections for the House of Burgesses in the last decades of the colonial period. This was a larger proportion than was usual in Massachusetts and other parts of America at a period a little later, with a sufficient margin to allow for the possibility that the populations we have assumed are underestimates. We are obliged to conclude one of two things—either that the suffrage was wider in Virginia than elsewhere, or that there was a fuller participation in its exercise by those qualified. Either supposition is adverse to the view that Virginia was a country of purely aristocratic government before the Revolution, and that the poor and the middle classes had little share in the management of public affairs. No doubt the poor man was subject in a great degree to the influence of his rich neighbor, under the system of viva-voce voting. Yet, all deductions made, it seems that the facts brought forward do something to support the theory that Virginian democracy was in some respects already in operation before the Revolution.

J. Franklin Jameson.

TOCQUEVILLE'S SOUVENIRS.—II.

Paris, April 13, 1893.

We left Tocqueville on the day after the Revolution of 1848. Paris was to him a curious subject of observation; he was struck by the character of the revolution which had just been accomplished, and by the absolute power which it had momentarily given to the people, and to those classes of the people which live by the work of their hands.

"Though," says he, "the working classes had often played a principal part in the events of the great Revolution, they had never become the conductors and the sole masters of the State, either *de jure* or *de facto*. The Convention contained, perhaps, not a single man of the people; it was full of bourgeois and of lettered men. The war between the Mountain and the Gironde was conducted on both sides by members of the bourgeoisie, and the triumph of the former never placed the power solely in the hands of the people. The Revolution of July, 1830, was made by the people, but the middle classes had prepared it, conducted it, and reaped the principal fruits of it. The February Revolution, on the contrary, seemed to have been made entirely outside of the bourgeoisie and against it. In this great struggle, the two parts which in France chiefly composed the social body had separated, and the people, remaining alone, was alone in possession of the power. Nothing could be more novel in our annals."

Tocqueville notes that, during the Revolution and immediately afterwards, all the agents of public security had disappeared; the city was patrolled by armed workingmen. The terror of the other classes was intense—it probably never was so great at the time of the first Revolution; it is compared by Tocqueville to the terror which must have been felt in the civilized cities of the Roman world when they suddenly found themselves in the hands of the Vandals and the Goths.

What Tocqueville sees and explains with the cold lucidity of his talent is the socialistic character of the new revolution. After the right of universal suffrage had been proclaimed—and it was proclaimed immediately—the people had no further civil rights to conquer; nevertheless, a hundred systems sprang out of the minds of the Socialists. There was a sort of spontaneous generation of plans for the reorganization of society.

"Everything," says Tocqueville, "was still erect except royalty and Parliament; but it seemed as if the shock of the Revolution had changed everything into dust, and as if a prize had been offered to the best form to be given to the new edifice. Each man had his plan: one offered it in the newspapers, another in placards, which covered the walls; another in speeches made in the open air. One wanted to suppress the inequality of fortunes, another the inequality of instruction, another undertook to destroy the most ancient of inequalities, the differences between man and woman. Specifics were presented against poverty, remedies given for the evil of work, which torments inequality since it exists. . . . Socialism will remain the essential character of the February Revolution; the Republic of 1848 will appear at a distance not as a means but as an end."

If Tocqueville were still alive, he might draw a curious parallel between the Socialism of 1848 and the Socialism of our time. The Socialists of 1848 had definite systems, they had formulas. We still remember, though a little vaguely, the *phalanstère* of Fourier and Considérant, the People's Bank of Proudhon, etc. The modern Socialists (I speak of the workingmen) have renounced all these empty theories; they think only of destroying, not of constructing. They look on society as divided into two classes, those who possess and those who do not possess; they consider capital and labor as antagonistic forces, and they imagine that labor is enslaved by capital. Force, brute force, seems to be their last resort against the tyranny of the middle classes. They can hardly be said to have any political opinions, and if they are Republican, it is simply because the Republic appears to them more destructive than the monarchy.

Few people in 1848 understood as well as Tocqueville the dangers of Socialism. As he says:

"The people at first tried to better its condition by means of political institutions; but, after every change, it found that its condition had not become any better, or was becoming better only with a slowness which seemed insupportable to the precipitancy of its desires. It was inevitable that it should, some day or other, discover that what made its condition narrow was not the constitution of the Government—that it was a result of the immutable laws of society; and it was natural that it should ask itself if it had not the power and the right to change these laws, as it had changed the others. And to speak specially of the right of property, which is the foundation of our social order, all the privileges which covered up and, so to speak, concealed this right having been destroyed, the right of property remained, in their eyes, the principal obstacle to a perfect equality of man, and was its only apparent sign; was it not necessary that it, too, should be abolished in its turn?"

No cry found more favor in 1848 than Proudhon's "La propriété, c'est le vol" (Property is robbery), and M. Thiers found it necessary to write a pamphlet in defence of property. The academic discussions which ensued between the Economists and the Socialists soon took a dramatic form in the streets. The Constituant Assembly which had been sent up to Paris by the country, found itself confronted by the Socialists. Tocqueville had been elected Deputy from the Department of the Manche. He gives a very vivid description of the elections, of the first meetings of the Constituant Assembly, of the invasion of the Assembly on the 15th of May by the populace of Paris, headed by its Socialist leaders. One of them, in the midst of a great tumult, declared, "in the name of the people," the dissolution of the National Assembly. The Assembly was saved by the National Guards, but it was clear that this great Socialist demonstration was the first act of a tremendous drama.

The drama took place in June; for a whole week, Paris became a great battlefield. Tocqueville says with reason that

"The insurrection of June was the greatest and the most singular in French history and perhaps in any history; the greatest, since, for four days, more than a hundred thousand men were engaged in it; the most singular, inasmuch as the insurgents fought without any war cry, without any chiefs, without any flags, and nevertheless with a marvellous *ensemble* and with a military experience which astonished the oldest officers. What also distinguished this insurrection among all the events of the same kind which have followed each other for sixty years, was the fact that its object was not to change the form of government, but to alter the state of society. It was not a political struggle, it was a conflict of classes, a servile war."

The philosophical mind of Tocqueville would soon have seen the secret connection between the insurrection of June and the Commune of 1871. The army which had no chiefs, no flag, no war cry in 1848, had found chiefs in 1871, it had the red flag, it had a war cry, "Vive la Commune!" And what meant this word commune? It was a word which in reality covered all the false theories, all the false hopes, all the jealousies, all the hatreds, all the aspirations of the classes which live by the toil of their hands. Now, as in 1848, these classes are told every day that the fortune of the rich is, as it were, something stolen from them; they are told that the inequality of fortunes is as contrary to justice and to morality as it is to nature itself. "The women," says Tocqueville, "took as much part in the insurrection of June as the men; while the men fought, the women prepared and brought the munitions, and when the necessity to surrender came, the women were the last to accept it."

Gen. Cavaignac fought the terrible battle of June with much ability and decision; he became a virtual dictator. Lamartine, and all the other members of the Government which had been formed after the Revolution of 1848, disappeared, so to speak, before him. Tocqueville had accepted the Republic without any enthusiasm, but with a conviction that the monarchy had become impossible. After the insurrection of June, he saw at once that the Republic was in danger, though the Constituant Assembly had won the victory. "The love of independence was to be replaced by fear, perhaps by some disgust of free institutions; after such an abuse of liberty, a reaction was inevitable. The movement of retreat began at once: first slow, almost invisible to the naked eye, afterwards rapid, finally, impetuous and irresistible."

It was well prophesied, and we know where the movement of retreat stopped: it brought France successively to the *coup d'état* of December, then to the proclamation of the Empire. Tocqueville, who was a Liberal, was to be one of the Ministers of Prince Louis Napoleon when the Prince was elected President of the Republic. His memoirs are interrupted after the insurrection of June. He jumps over

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the period which extends from that epoch till June, 1849. "I will," he says, "return to it later, if I have time. It has seemed more important to me, while my recollections were still fresh, to retrace the five months which I spent in the Government." The short-lived Cabinet in which Tocqueville was Minister of Foreign Affairs was composed of himself; of Odilon Barrot, President of the Council; of Passy, head of the Finances; of Dufaure, head of the Home Office, and a few others, now forgotten. The portrait which Tocqueville gives of the Prince-President is very interesting, as he was, of all Napoleon's ministers, and perhaps of all the men who would not take part in his conspiracy against the Republic, the politician who was the highest advanced in his favor, who saw the most of him and could best judge him.

"He was very superior to what people could have judged from his previous life and his mad enterprises. . . . He had, as a private person, some engaging qualities: an easy and benevolent disposition, a humane character, a kind and even somewhat tender though not delicate soul, . . . perfect simplicity, a certain modesty in the midst of the immense pride which his origin gave him. Capable of feeling affection, he could inspire it among those who approached him. His conversation was rare and sterile; he had not the art of making others talk and enter into intimate relations with him, nor any facility in speaking, but writing habits and a certain vanity of authorship. His dissimulation, which was profound, like that of a man who had spent his life in plotting, was singularly aided by his motionless features and expressionless gaze, for his eyes were dull and opaque, like ground glass, which lets the light pass, but through which you see nothing. Very indifferent to danger, he had a fine and cool courage in a crisis, and at the same time (which is a common thing) he was very vacillating in his designs. . . . His intelligence was incoherent, confused, full of great thoughts badly put together, sometimes borrowed from the examples of Napoleon, sometimes from Socialistic theories, sometimes from the memories of England, a country in which he had lived; from very different and often contrary sources. He had with difficulty collected his ideas in solitary meditation, apart from men and things, for he was naturally a dreamer, fond of chimeras. . . . But, when he was forced to leave these vague and vast regions and to keep within the limits of business, his mind was found capable of a just conclusion, often with finesse and even a certain depth, but never quite safe, and always ready to couple an odd idea with a just one."

The portrait is very long, and I can give only a part of it; it is delineated with much care.

Tocqueville had, in his short career as Minister of Foreign Affairs, to study all the affairs of Europe. With his usual depth of thought, he foresaw many of the transformations which have taken place since the proclamation of the Second Empire. This part of his Memoirs, which ends them, is not the least interesting, and, at times, it is truly prophetic.

Correspondence.

THE CHICAGO MAYORALTY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The following from the last issue of the *Nation* is misleading:

"The defeat of the better element in Chicago by the bummer and semi-criminal element under Mr. Carter Harrison—and in the Exposition year, too—has naturally excited much attention in this city. Some solved the problem by throwing doubt on the existence of a better element in Chicago."

Harrison's election was due not to his being satisfactory to the voters, but to the fact of his opponent being very unsatisfactory. It is generally conceded that had Mr. Lyman J. Gage, the President of the First National Bank, been persuaded to run against Harrison, the latter would have stood no chance at all. But "Sam" Allerton—that is the way he is always designated—is, for business reasons, particularly obnoxious to the labor element. Then, for social reasons, he was unsatisfactory to a large number of the "better element." Perhaps it might be said that in his business record he represents the better element, and thereby lost a large vote, while in his social qualifications he does not represent the "better element," and thereby lost another large vote.

It is precisely because this is "Exposition year" that this latter objection told heavily against him. Many who go to make up "the better element," and who in ordinary years would have voted for "Sam" Allerton, for this particular year preferred Harrison, and for the simple reason that he is, in the conventional sense, a scholar and a gentleman. No one questions his education, nor—barring his egotism—his evidences of culture; while his long and varied experience as Congressman, Mayor, traveller, writer, and entertainer, coupled with his natural fitness for social intercourse, qualifies him to welcome any and all of the men, women, and children who visit the World's Fair this summer.

Aside from all this, Mr. Allerton, though undoubtedly an honest, well-meaning man, is, as the executive head of public affairs, an unknown quantity; and this is not the time for Chicago to make experiments.

F. I. Nance.

Chicago, April 16, 1893.

DANTE AT OXFORD.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In your review of the 'Translatio et Comentum totius Libri Dantis' of Johannes de Serravalle, I notice the following passage: "But the chief interest in the commentary for English readers is that in it is the only bit of evidence that can possibly be cited for what Englishmen sometimes try hard to believe—that Dante studied at Oxford, or at least visited it." I venture to call your attention to the fact that this statement is not strictly and absolutely true. It is, indeed, true that no early authority except this distinctly mentions Dante's studies at Oxford; but there is a much earlier passage implying a visit of Dante to England, which, considering Dante's character, it might not unfairly be argued, carried with it a visit at least to Oxford. This is to be found in the famous 'Carmen in laudem Dantis,' written by Boccaccio to accompany a copy of Dante sent to Petrarch. The lines are as follows:

"Novisti forsan et ipse,
Traxerit ut iuvenem Phœbus per celsa nivosi
Cyrrheos, mediosque sinus tacitosque recessus
Naturæ, cælique vias, terræque, marisque,
Aonios fontes, Parnassi culmen, et antra
Julia, Pariseos dudum, extremosque Britannos."

There exist of the "Carmen" two somewhat divergent texts, both of which have often been printed (see A. Hortis's 'Studj sulle opere Latine del Boccaccio,' Trieste, 1879, p. 791, for an enumeration of the editions. The texts have both been printed by Carducci, 'Studi Letterari,' 2d ed., Leghorn, 1880, pp. 357-8-9). So far as I know, this is the only statement from a writer of the *trecento* which can be cited as evidence of Dante's visit to England. A passage in Witte's 'Dante-Forschungen,' I., 433, has, to be sure, sometimes been used carelessly as corroborative. It is the following: "Il dotto Inglese Taeffe lo conduce nel 1313 a Venezia, Parigi, Avignone, 'forse' a Oxford, fondandosi sopra un aneddoto riferito dal così detto Ottimo." But Witte must have been quoting from memory when he wrote this. What he had in mind was undoubtedly the following from Count Taafe's (*not* Taeffe) 'Comment on the Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri,' London, 1822, p. 48: "In 1313 he was in Venice and Paris and Avignon and, perhaps, Oxford." Taafe says nothing about an anecdote from the 'Ottimo'; and at the bottom of the page he cites *Serravalle ap. Cancel.*, p. 44 (*i. e.*, Fr. Cancellieri, 'Osservazioni, etc., sopra l'Originalità della Divina Commedia di Dante,' Rome, 1814—where again no such anecdote is mentioned). I know of no such anecdote myself, and I find that Bartoli ('Storia della Letteratura italiana,' t. v., p. 219, note) has also been unable to find it.

Perhaps it should be added that even Boccaccio's statement has been regarded by good scholars as rather rhetorical than trustworthy—as, for example, by Bartoli. Still, the statement of your reviewer remains somewhat too sweeping. It is only too easy, at present, however, unguardedly to neglect bits of evidence in regard to Dante's life. Thus, in the article Dante in 'La Grande Encyclopédie,' by M. Jeanroy, which was rightly praised by you in a note some months ago, I find it said: "C'est à cette époque seulement [1307–10] que pourrait se placer son voyage à Paris, qui est assez problématique. Ceux que l'ont admis ne s'appuient que sur un passage de la lettre de Fra Ilario, sur les quelques vers du Paradis (X) relatifs à Siger de Brabant, et surtout sur l'étendue des connaissances théologiques du poète." M. Jeanroy must mean to exclude all but contemporary evidence, for Boccaccio, Benvenuto da Imola, Manetti, and other later writers speak of Dante's studies in Paris. Yet there is one bit of contemporary evidence of prime importance that has escaped his notice. It is the statement of Giovanni Villani (ix, 136): "E però sanza altra colpa colla detta parte bianca fu cacciato e sbandito di Firenze, e andossene allo studio a Bologna, e poi a Parigi, e in più parti del mondo." This last clause, by the way, might be used without too great violence by the believers in Dante's English pilgrimage, as in a general way strengthening their case.

Perhaps the moral of all this is that the next great task to be undertaken for the advancement of the study of Dante is a collection of all the passages, at least from the *trecento*, that bear upon the poet's life. These passages are indeed now accessible. But until they are printed completely and systematically together, even the best scholars will occasionally make slips.

I am, sir, very truly yours,

Arthur Richmond Marsh.

Cambridge, Mass., April 13, 1893.

[We had in mind, while writing, the well-known passage to which Prof. Marsh kindly calls our attention. But we concluded, after deliberation, not to consider it as evidence, on the ground—to which Prof. Marsh himself refers—that Boccaccio's verses are obviously "rather rhetorical than trustworthy," and the phrase *extremosque Britannos* merely equivalent to Ultima Thule; especially as the passage, if taken literally, involves a statement inconsistent with Boccaccio's distinct assertions, both in his Life and in his Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. Dr. Edward Moore, in tr ating the question in his 'Dante and his Early Biographers,' decides that this fact alone makes even the genuineness of the v.rses doubtful.—Ed. Nation.]

THE CLEFT INFINITIVE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: After reading Dr. Fitzedward Hall's long communication in your issue of April 13, I was inclined to leave the question about "the cleft infinitive" where he has left it: but, on second thoughts, I have decided to ask you to print what I mean to print in the next edition of 'The Foundations of Rhetoric':

"Since the last edition of this book was published, Dr. Fitzedward Hall has contributed to the *Nation* (New York) of April 13, 1893, a paper on what he calls 'the cleft infinitive.' The citations in this paper, which come from various sources, confirm Dr. Hall's assertion that the practice of putting the adverb between *to* and the infinitive has existed from an early date, and is supported by a body of writers respectable both in numbers and in position. It is clear that usage is, to a certain extent, divided; but it is also clear that the writers who are of the highest authority, and who decide what is the best use, either do not employ this locution at all or employ it very sparingly. It may, moreover, be noted that Dr. Hall is careful to say that he himself habitually avoids 'the cleft infinitive.' On the whole, the safest conclusion still seems to be that arrived at in the text, namely, that a careful writer will do well to avoid the construction which places the adverb between *to* and the infinitive. It is true that the construction in question is a common one; but it is also true that those who are most addicted to the practice are not those who count most as authorities on questions of good usage."

I will not end this communication without expressing my regret that Dr. Fitzedward Hall should have seen anything in my references to him to lead him to think that I intended to treat him with disrespect. For many years I have read his writings on questions of language with interest and profit, and I have always regarded him as among the scholars whose opinion on any subject is entitled to great weight. I regret particularly that he should put an interpretation on the word *naïvely* which is very far from my meaning. As regards the truth of his charge that my book suffers from a "plerophory of cocksureness," I must leave my readers to judge for themselves. If I have sometimes fallen into this fault, I can only plead by way of defence that it is extremely difficult when one has to deal briefly with a great many questions, small and great, to avoid the appearance of dogmatism altogether.—Very truly yours,

A. S. Hill.

Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass., April 19, 1893.

Notes.

Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati, have in preparation 'The History of Illinois and Louisiana under the French Rule,' by Jos. Wallace; and in press a limited edition of three companion volumes—'Donn Piatt, His Work and His Ways,' by Charles Grant Miller; Col. Piatt's 'Sunday Meditations' and his 'Plays and Poems.' The same firm have just issued their new trade catalogue, 'Bibliotheca Americana,' whose appearance is always a notable event.

Capt. R. H. Raymond Smythies, Curragh Camp, Ireland, announces that he has in preparation a history of the Fortieth Regiment, now the First Battalion of the South Lancashire Regiment. The early career of this regiment is closely connected with our colonial history, as it was formed in the very early part of the last century out of companies stationed in this country. The first colonel was Gen. Richard Phillips, who was, from 1717 to 1749, the Governor of Nova Scotia. The first senior captain, and afterwards for many years Lieutenant-Colonel, was Gen. Paul Mascarene, Acting-Governor of the province during a considerable portion of this time. Gen. Phillips, who very much neglected the regiment, was succeeded in the command by Col. Edward Cornwallis, the founder of Halifax. The regiment formed for many years the garrison of the posts at Annapolis, Canso, and Placentia. The author hopes to publish the work about the end of the year.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have in press 'From Chattanooga to Petersburg under Generals Grant and Butler: A Contribution to the History of the War and a Personal Vindication,' by Gen. William Farrar Smith, with maps and plans.

The Graduate Club of Harvard, in conjunction with like clubs at Cornell and at Johns Hopkins, will issue in July a handbook for the use of students who are pursuing or who mean to pursue graduate studies. The first part will be historical and statistical; the second will contain a list of lecture and research courses of advanced character open to graduate students in 1893–'94, conveniently arranged, in connection with "the names and scholastic record of the instructors giving them." The committee's secretary is Mr. A. W. Weysse, Hollis Hall, Cambridge, Mass.

Yale University has just issued a pamphlet 'Bibliographies' of its present officers, which is retrospective and will be hereafter succeeded by annual bibliographies. We remark the omission of Prof. Lounsbury's name without being able to account for it. The general list is preceded by that of the late Noah Porter, going back to 1834, and casting much light on the scope of his intellectual and public interests. To one who knows what the years 1850, 1851, stand for in our political history, and what the attitude of the New York *Observer* was on the slavery question, the following innocent entries speak volumes as to Prof. Porter's share in the great struggle: 1850—"The Conflict of Laws," New York *Observer*, November 30, December 7. 1851—"The Atrocious Doctrine," *ibid.*, January 9, January 16; "Our Duty to the State," *ibid.*, January 30; "Dr. Bacon on the Fugitive Slave Law," *ibid.*, February 27, March 20. The last three articles were anonymous (editorial) contributions, and we suspect the writer to have been much exercised by the conflict between the Higher Law and the Fugitive Slave Law, with clerical prepossessions in favor of the latter.

D. D. Merrill Co. will have ready next month 'Out of the Sunset Sea,' by Judge A. W. Tourgée, illustrated by his daughter.

The series of short stories which Mr. H. C. Bunner has been contributing to *Puck* under the title of "Made in France," and which are daring adaptations from the French of Guy de Maupassant, will be published in a volume by Keppler & Schwarzmann, uniform with Mr. Bunner's 'Short Sixes' and 'The Runaway Browns.'

D. C. Heath & Co. are about to bring out a 'Petite Histoire de la Littérature Française,' by Prof. Delphine Duval of Smith College.

The sixth volume of Perrot and Chipiez's "Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité," viz., 'La Grèce Primitive—L'Art Mycénien,' has begun to be published in instalments (Paris: Hachette; New York: Christern).

Hachette & Co. have just published Victor Cherbuliez's latest novel, 'Le Secret du Précepteur,' and a pleasure it is to read a tale which is filled neither with obscenity nor with an overabundance of minute analysis of sentiment or passion. 'Le Secret' does not equal 'Meta Holdenis,' perhaps, but it is a well-told story, very interesting, and very much more real and natural than much of the stuff the realists and naturalists have given us of late. The character of the *précepteur* himself and that of the lovable and lovely Monique are drawn in Cherbuliez's best style. There is a tenderness in the way the secret is revealed bit by bit and a firmness in the conduct of the story, an avoidance of the romantic and a fidelity to life as it is, which will commend the book to the author's numerous admirers. It is not a great novel, but it is a good one, well composed, well written, and clean—for which last quality one is profoundly thankful in these days.

The twenty-third volume to appear of M. Jusserand's "Grands Écrivains Français," is the 'Lesage' of M. Eugène Lintilhac (Paris: Hachette; New York: F. W. Christern). The average merit of this series is surprisingly high, but the present work is not one of the best. The structure of the biography is solid enough, and the criticism is adequate in the main, but the style is not easy. M. Lintilhac points out, what is often overlooked, that 'Gil Blas' is not only a most original work (in spite of its borrowed incidents), but a novel of great importance in the history of the development of the art of fiction.

The first complete translation of 'War and Peace' has just appeared in the series of Tolstoi's works edited by Raphael Löwenfeld (Berlin: Richard Wilhelmi), of which it occupies four volumes (v.—viii.), or something like 2,000 pages. The larger half of the version is by Claire von Glümer; the remainder is Löwenfeld's, and is rather severely criticised by a reviewer in the Berlin *Nation*, who can say no more of it than that it can be read (*lesbar*)—and this is surely a pity in the case of an authorized edition.

There is nothing very fresh or valuable in Mr. H. M. Stanley's 'Slavery and the Slave Trade in Africa' (Harper's Black and White Series, into which it has been taken over from the *Monthly* for March). A brief sketch of the history of slavery in modern times, which is marred by several errors, is followed by an interesting account of some noted Arab slave-hunters and their methods. The work of the Congo Free State is described at some length, but we suspect Mr. Stanley, very naturally, takes too roseate a view of its present condition and prospects. The energy of the Germans in suppressing the slave trade on the east coast is contrasted, not quite fairly, with the comparative, but possibly prudent, inactivity of the English. Uganda is barely mentioned, but the familiar moral arguments for the construction of a railway to the Victoria Nyanza are stated, not very forcibly. Though Mr. Stanley attempts to review the present situation in the whole of Africa, he omits to call attention to the fact that slavery, apparently in its worst forms, still exists in some parts of the Portuguese possessions. Several of the illustrations, by Remington, are strikingly good.

'Civilization's Inferno; or, Studies in the Social Cellar,' by B. O. Flower (Boston: Arena Publishing Company), is an attempt "to portray the infinite misery which is the lot of tens

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of thousands of struggling souls in the full blaze of our boasted Christian civilization," especially as seen "in the populous slums of cultured, palace-decked, church-jewelled Boston." With a view to deepen the lurid effect, Mr. Flower brings in passages from Mr. Ward McAllister and others, illustrating the shocking frivolity and immorality of fashionable life. The book is too feeble and hysterical to be taken seriously, and the philanthropical will be wise to leave such literature unread and to study rather Mr. Booth's investigations into the condition of the poor of London.

Mr. R. P. Greg sends us a beautiful royal octavo of some four or five hundred pages (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.). The title awakens our suspicions. It reads: 'Comparative Philology of the Old and New Worlds in relation to Archaic Speech.' But alas! the contents are simply pathetic. They consist chiefly of tables of what the author is pleased to denominate "philological accordances." A column of "Sundries," for example, embracing Malay, Chinese, Akkadian, Etruscan, etc., is compared with columns of words labelled "Semitic," "Aryan," and "American" (North, Central, and South)—all in an aimless jumble, and without any apparent system or purpose or results. But we get a hint of the kind of result to which such pseudo-investigations lead in the preface: "The almost universal importance of the *k* sound in words expressive of pain; surprise; action; height; greatness; evil; darkness, etc."! At the end, Mr. Greg gives, among "Books and authors generally referred to, but not actually consulted," "Prof. D. Whitney, U. S. Languages and the study of languages." Mr. Greg's blunder is all too significant. Had he studied *language* more, and less *languages*, or if he had even read carefully the work in question, doubtless his own book would never have been written. He calls it a "labour of love." Love's labor was never more completely lost.

Baird's 'Greek-English Word-List' (Ginn & Co.) contains a well-chosen list of about a thousand Greek words most commonly used, arranged in a manner to facilitate memorizing. It will be useful in the practice of writing Greek, and also in acquiring a minimum foundation of serviceable vocabulary.

'The Gods of Olympus' (Cassell Publishing Co.) is a manual of Greek and Roman Mythology, translated and adapted by Katherine A. Raleigh from the 'Olympos' of Dr. Petiscus. It is intended primarily for boys and girls, and has the merit of presenting its labyrinthine subject in a readable and orderly narrative, adorned by apt quotations from Tennyson and Browning and Matthew Arnold and Swinburne. Notwithstanding the praiseworthy footnotes and references furnished by Miss Harrison, the book is hardly likely to be of service to advanced students. A good index makes it available for the uses of a dictionary of mythology, and the illustrations, though sometimes vaguely symbolical of the originals, are more numerous and better chosen than in most works of the kind. Dr. Petiscus's point of view is old-fashioned and oblivious of sun-myth or totemism. This is no harm, as Miss Harrison observes in her preface; since, at present, doctors disagree about the unravelling of the complicated web of mythology. An old-fashioned spelling of proper names might have suited the conservative story of Dr. Petiscus; but Miss Raleigh prefers to follow Grote, with some inconsistencies and oddities of her own, such as Kreta and Crete, Plouton and Pluto, Heraklidai, Erythia, and finally Silen, once or twice, for Silenus.

Surprise at their number is the first feeling with which one opens the thick book about 'Authors and Writers Associated with Morristown [N. J.],' by Mrs. Julia Keese Colles (Morristown: Vogt Bros.). But three considerations tend to abate this feeling: (1) the age of the town and the prestige it early acquired from Washington's presence; (2) the fact that Morristown is a suburb of New York and now merely a sleeping-place for a certain number of persons whose literary work is done in New York; and (3) the generous inclusiveness of this collection. Between Washington and the youngsters who write their little pieces for the college papers there is room for many grades of fame and merit. Poets, novelists, historians, essayists, theologians, etc., are all here. One of the last, by the way, should have been consulted about the "Armenian Bible" on page 342. Another less pardonable error is found on page 330, where the Rev. John L. Stephens, a missionary to Mexico, who was assassinated there some years ago, is confounded with the Central American traveller. To dwellers in Morristown the book makes its main appeal, and it was probably never intended to invite criticism from non-residents.

Though *Two Tales* has gone under, in spite of its decorous management, short stories are to have still another chosen medium, *Storiettes*, a monthly venture published at No. 119 Potter Building, in this city.

The April number of the *Charities Review* contains the complete text of the remarkable and stimulating address delivered by Mr. Hewitt at the opening of the United Charities Building last month.

Those who have felt the undeniable greatness and even preëminence of Japanese art, and have still asked themselves how they ought to rank it in comparison with classic and modern Western art, will do well to buy or to consult the third number of that Boston quarterly "magazine of appreciation," the *Knight Errant*. Prof. E. F. Fenollosa attempts to analyze for Western eyes the beauty of the frontispiece design, "The Bodhisattwa Kwannon," by Nishiyama Hoyen. "In this sense [of spiritual beauty] the work takes rank with creations of Angelico and Lippi"; in the unalterableness of its lines, the drapery "is like the drapery of a truly great Greek statue"—these are some of the writer's suggestive expressions.

The spring number of *Modern Art* (Indianapolis: J. M. Bowles) is chiefly distinguished by a collotype of Rossetti's "Beata Beatrix," in the collection of Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson of Chicago.

Mr. Gustav Kobbé has got out, through the Globe Map Co., No. 2 Spring Street, New York, a very useful suburban road map, of which the peculiar feature is an indication of good roads by a solid red line, and of ordinary by parallel lines. The map is mainly for New Jersey, where the region covered extends from Lake Hopatcong, Green Pond, Pompton, and Hohokus on the north to South Amboy and New Brunswick on the south. But also the whole of Staten Island, Long Island to Jamaica, and New York to Hastings and New Rochelle, are embraced. The whole is folded for the pocket.

Mr. William I. Fletcher, librarian of Amherst College, will open his summer School of Library Economy on July 24, and close it on August 26, giving daily instruction in the meantime, the class being regarded as beginners ignorant of library work. Mr. Fletcher may be addressed at Amherst.

We are requested by Messrs. Harper to state that, owing to a clerical misunderstanding, in a recent advertisement of theirs in this journal Dr. William J. Rolfe of Cambridge was said to be of Harvard University, though he has no official connection with that institution.

In our notice, last week, of 'Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life,' we mentioned, besides the London publisher, the name of the American importer. The *publishers* in this country are G. P. Putnam's Sons.

—The University of Vermont has favored us with a pres ntation copy of its elaborate and costly Catalogue of the Library of George Perkins Marsh, with which the late Frederick Billings generously endowed the main library of that institution. The labor of compiling this great quarto volume of nearly 750 pages has been very scrupulously and minutely performed by Mr. H. L. Koopman, and is deserving of high praise. The use of bold-face type, however, seems to us to have been carried to a degree which often defeats its own end, by confusing instead of clarifying. Some twelve thousand volumes are thus made available to students in that broad field of learning and of human interest which distinguished Mr. Marsh. Twelve columns are given up to an enumeration of his own works, and here we remark his much-prized contributions to the *Nation*, beginning with his acute discussion of State sovereignty, and ending with a notice of Lanciani's 'Aqueducts of Ancient Rome,' in a period of seventeen years. The list has been annotated by Mr. Marsh's own hand and by the compiler's, and contains some MS. corrections of errata. Mr. Lowell reviewed 'Man and Nature' for the *North American Review* with a zest and sympathy which still do not permit the imagination to associate the author of the 'Biglow Papers' with Mr. Marsh in promoting, say, the introduction of the camel into the United States. Mr. Marsh, again, was far less touched and turned aside by the anti-slavery conflict than was Mr. Lowell. In the one column of titles given to Slavery, half are foreign. Mr. Marsh's set of Channing's works, with Emerson's Divinity School address, Parker's revival sermons, and his own occasional contributions to the *Christian Examiner*, indicate his Unitarian affiliations. His sturdy Protestantism is shown in the rich rubrics, Popes, Catholic Church, Church History, Church and State—in all, nearly eleven columns. The Spiritualistic phenomenon seems to have interested him but little, perhaps because of his absence from the country during its rise and growth. In the general works on poetry, Shairp's 'Poetic Interpretation of Nature' (1877) is the latest. Scott's verse is the only part of his productions embraced in the collection, and George Eliot's 'Spanish Gypsy' in like manner is unaccompanied by her novels. Neither Fielding, Jane Austen, nor Thackeray is taken into this scholar's working library, and of Dickens only 'Nicholas Nickleby.' Goethe fills one column, Dante four, Petrarch and Boccaccio one each. Rousseau is directly represented solely by 'Émile.' There are four works of Darwin's, and some Darwiniana. The medical column is largely antique, with no hint of Mr. Marsh's preference for any school. Several of Ruskin's works occur in the two columns of fine arts. Finally, on p. 445 is an account of the portraits of Mr. Marsh.

—After the man, it remains, perhaps, to say a word or two about the scholar and the diplomat. The author of 'Lectures on the English Language' would naturally be well equipped in the department of English Dialects, Language, and Literature, which in fact fills twelve columns. So we discern the author of 'A Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendious Grammar of the Old Northern or Icelandic Language' in the four columns given to Danish, the twelve to Icelandic, five to Swedish, etc. The entries under Turkey, the Levant, and Greece betoken collectively an enlightened United States Minister to the Porte; while the Minister to Italy and contemplated author of a treatise on the Roman Campagna and an English-Italian Dictionary shines in the twenty-two columns allotted to Italy, besides the four given to Latin. We might add the respectable French contingent, the Russian (but nothing apparently in the language itself), the Swiss dialects, etc. Of the mere collector's hoarding there is comparatively little trace. We observe some three dozen Elzevirs, and some early printed books, of which thirteen antedate 1500. As a whole, this catalogue is a monument to a singularly learned and curious mind, many-sided, humane, and liberal; and to a public career full of honor to America.

—Our note on books with backs to the wall has brought us letters from Nevada, Vermont, and Virginia which we have published. The Vermont account of a frontispiece in the works of Seneca is a new illustration of our view; but the date of that publication (1620) is a generation before the Italian's visit to the Escorial we had mentioned. Had the writer noticed this, he would not have supposed he was showing the old custom to have been "in men's minds" at a later era than our note had indicated. Another indication that the old custom was then not only in men's minds, but carried out in practice on their book-shelves, is afforded by a famous print of the Library in the University of Leyden—"cum pulpitis et arcis vera iconographia"—by Jan Cornelius Woudanus, executed within a decade or two of the Seneca frontispiece. In this engraving, tags hang down from the lower clasp on every volume, and it is clear that every book in the twenty-two ranges of shelves stands with its back hid from view. Did the bodies of divinity in the Library of early Harvard stand with their backs to the wall? The opinion that they so stood is countenanced by a fact that has just come to our knowledge. "Detur" is defined in Worcester as "a term applied to a book *given* as a present to a meritorious undergraduate in Harvard University." Now one of the officials in the Boston Public Library remembers to have seen a Detur of the year 1773 furnished with a tag bearing the title of the work, and so attached as to enable one to know the book if it stood with its back to the wall. The tags hanging down from modern books, by the way, seem to be a survival from old Roman times. They are almost identical with the classical *tituli*, in a Herculaneum picture shown by a cut under the word Liber in Smith's 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities.'

—The Reciprocity Treaty with Canada of 1854 is the subject of a seventy-page pamphlet by Frederick E. Haynes, issued as No. 6, vol. vii., of the Publications of the American Economic Association. The charge that the treaty was "floated through on champagne" is shown to have had at least this truth in it, that a ratifying majority in the Senate was won over by the social arts of Lord Elgin. He had been assured by Marcy that the undertaking was hopeless, and the Secretary could scarcely believe his ears when told that the task was accomplished. The Canadian Governor-General had a lively private secretary with him in Washington in the person of Laurence Oliphant, and from his pen we have an inside account of the way Lord Elgin found the sturdy republican hearts of the Democratic Senators not too hardened against the personal attentions and flattery of a live Lord. Oliphant was finally able to write to his mother on June 7, 1854: "We are tremendously triumphant; we have signed a stunning treaty." He describes the midnight scene when the treaty was being engrossed ready for signature, and shows that not all our public men had been lured away from the path of democratic simplicity, for he pictures Marcy as listening to the reading "while he picks his teeth with a pair of scissors, or clears out the wick of the candles with their points and wipes them on his hair." Mr. Haynes's account of the actual working of the treaty is patient and fair. He shows that it had considerable influence in increasing commercial exchanges, after making due allowance for the natural expansion of the two countries and for the inevitable growth of that "commerce of convenience" which no tariff or treaty can wholly make or destroy. Its repeal was more a political than a commercial measure, and provoked strong protests from trade centres. The Detroit Convention of 1865 was notable for its array of Republicans, all unconscious of the coming dogma of their party, who protested against restraints on trade, and said with Hannibal Hamlin, fresh from the Vice-Presidency: "I am for free trade." Mr. Haynes does not fail to point out in conclusion that the Canadian treaty was in this country, like the commercial treaties which came so thick in Europe a little later, a part of a liberalizing movement which war here, as there, broke in upon—and so impressed statesmen with its inherent blessings that they felt bound to continue them to the people in time of peace.

—To those who have followed the progress of the New English Art Club, it is disappointing to find that in their London shows they are relying more and more upon outside exhibitors. This spring, as so often heretofore, the best work comes from men who are non-members. The members themselves, with one exception, contribute little of importance. But this one exception is decidedly noteworthy. Mr. Charles W. Furse, quite a young painter, who came before the public prominently last year as a faithful student of Mr. Whistler, is exhibiting a large portrait of a master of the hounds, which already has made much talk in London. For its size alone, it would have been conspicuous in an exhibition where the canvases are, as a rule, small. But for technical excellence as well it seems to hold its own with no little distinction. To show a huntsman in red coat, on his horse, the hounds at his feet, and for background a wide stretch of rolling country dotted with red coats of riders, is by no means a light task, even for the accomplished master. There are few, if any, other Englishmen to-day who would venture to tackle it. That the picture has been criticised is inevitable. Its color scheme has been pronounced a failure in its heaviness and blackness, the two principal figures are declared the least successful, though no one yet has questioned the fine drawing in the hounds, the delightful treatment of the background, and, above all, the vitality of the entirely conventional composition. But that which makes the canvas of special interest is, paradoxical as it sounds, the fact that it is quite out of sympathy with its surroundings in the New English Art Club. Mr. Furse, who has not yet found himself, has deserted Mr. Whistler, has turned his back upon the Glasgow School, whose methods he borrowed for a while, and has gone for inspiration partly to old academical conventions, partly to Munich. Usually, in studying a man's work, it is as impertinent as it is irrelevant to consider his personal affairs or social position. But in Mr. Furse's case a new light seems to be thrown upon his art and its promise when it is known that he belongs to the family of Sir Joshua Reynolds, and also that he comes of clerical stock, so that conservatism, however it may manifest itself, is his by rightful inheritance. He is predestined, as it were, for the Royal Academy, and it remains to be seen whether he is strong enough to resist the deadening Academical influence. Certainly, he seems to have it in his power, if he perseveres, to revive the traditions of the old school of portrait-painting when there were great painters in England, and yet to avail himself in this revival of all that is finest in the more modern developments of art. At all events, his is a career to be watched with interest.

—A little pamphlet, 'Apuntes para un Libro sobre los Aborigenes de Costa Rica,' emanating from the pen of Manuel M. de Peralta, the scholarly Minister from Costa Rica to the United States, and lately published by M. Murillo, Madrid, proves upon examination to be a valuable contribution to the ethnology of that region. It was intended as an accompaniment to the Costa Rican exhibit of antiquities at the recent historical exposition in Madrid, but possesses an interest quite independent of that collection. A brief outline of the geographical distribution of the eight Costa Rican tribes, their linguistic affinities and individual characteristics, furnishes a clear conception of these peoples as related to the other inter-Isthmian families. Dr. Peralta is at some pains to distinguish the Chorotega tribe from that known as Choloteca, with whom some writers have made confusion, the name being derived from Xoloteca, the inhabitants of Xolotlan—that is to say, the Mangues. Attention is also called to a remarkable influence, common throughout Spanish America, of a surrounding civilization in causing the abandonment of the arts and industries practised by the aborigines before the discovery. This is due, not to the effects of conquest, for many of these people have never come under the domination of the whites, but to the ease with which their needs may be satisfied by bartering a few natural products for articles of European manufacture. Considering this pleasing introduction, and in view of Dr. Peralta's previous valuable works on Costa Rica, we shall await with interest the forthcoming book which it promises.

—Friedrich Rückert's life as professor of Oriental literatures at the University of Erlangen during the thirties of this century is the subject of a recent monograph by Dr. Friedrich Reuter, published as the literary supplement of the *Jahresbericht des Königl. Christianeums zu Altona* for 1892–'93. Although a whole in itself, the present work is at the same time a continuation of an earlier treatise published by the same writer in 1888, which dealt with the influence exercised upon Rückert's poetry by one of his Erlangen colleagues, the philologist and philosopher Joseph Kopp. The friendship of these two men forms the background of the present study also, and it certainly deserves the loving, painstaking care with which the author has endeavored to bring it out in all its fulness and nobility. Kopp was a man of a truly platonic power of admiration. "It is a part of my nature," he says of himself, "to hold before my mind a personality better than myself, to exalt it and strip it of the imperfec-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions and shortcomings of real life. The purer we keep within us the ideal image of a friend, the more helpful for ourselves as well as for him will be our intercourse, and the more easily can we wipe away whatever of earthly dust may cover his heavenly form." In Rückert he found a man whom it needed little beautifying imagination to consider as an ideal type, a man whose higher nature had maintained itself pure and undisfigured in a life of many disappointments. Rückert himself, on the other hand, needed just such a man as Kopp to develop his poetic nature. If we remember that Rückert, next to Heine, was undoubtedly the foremost German poet in the period immediately following Goethe's death, and if we recall the deep patriotic fervor of his "Geharnischte Sonette," the wealth of tender feeling in his "Liebesfrühling," the inspiring view of nature and man taught in his "Weisheit des Brahmanen," it seems nearly incredible that at the very height of his manhood he should have been without any personal following, a lonely man in spite of his world-wide sympathies, an exile in his own country. And yet such was practically the case. The Government suspected him on account of his liberal views, and, notwithstanding his prominent position among German Orientalists, kept him for years on a mere pittance of a salary, while with the bulk of his colleagues at the University he had no connection whatever, his poetic production being considered by most of them as mere trifling.

"Ich schäme mich vor meinen Herrn Kollegen,
Dass ich hab' ausgegeben die Gedichte,"

he says himself. Even among the students, swayed as the majority of them were by the religious and political reaction of the Metternich era, there were only a few select ones who recognized in him the humane, unbiassed, self-forgetful teacher that he was.

—It was Kopp who rescued the poet from the gloom of self-distrust which had settled upon his mind in consequence of this shameful lack of popular response. Dr. Reuter gives a truly charming picture of the way in which he entered into Rückert's higher life, how he made himself the interpreter of his poetry, how liberally he imparted to him from the store of his own knowledge and philosophic insight, and how, in his sympathetic and disinterested criticism, Rückert found encouragement and incentive for unflagging effort. At least one of Kopp's remarks about Rückert's poetry may here be quoted, bringing out, as it does, one of its most fundamental and permanent qualities:

"Rückert," he says, "is a lyrical Schelling. His poetry, like the latter's philosophy, proceeds from a contemplation of the mutual affinity and essential union of nature and spirit. His view of the universe is comparable in grandeur and breadth only to that of the old Hindu poets; and as it is said of some flowers in the Himalaya Mountains that they shed a light of their own, so Rückert's poems sparkle in a peculiar magic splendor, indicating that, though rooted in the visible, they are reaching out into a realm of endless mysteries."

THE DUKE'S INVISIBLE FOUNDATIONS.

The Unseen Foundations of Society. An Examination of the Fallacies and Failures of Economic Science due to Neglected Elements. By the Duke of Argyll, K.G., K.T. London: John Murray; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1893.

"My mind conceives nothing narrow or limited," wrote Prince Metternich in his diary in 1819; "I always go, on every side, far beyond all that occupies the greater number of men of business; I cover ground infinitely larger than they can see or wish to see. I cannot help saying to myself twenty times a day: Good God! how right I am and how wrong they are! . . . At the present moment every one is wrong except myself."

This language accurately expresses the attitude of the Duke of Argyll, if not towards all mankind, at least towards the expounders of economic science. Those of the present day are granted a certain modicum of commendation in so far as they have repudiated the *dogmas of their predecessors, but even in this* repudiation they have not discriminated wisely, while their own conclusions are lame and impotent. They have done well to be angry at the deception practised by the orthodox economists in palming off their fallacies as scientific truths, they have not spoken too strongly in declaring that the detection of these fallacies has reduced economics to a "mere wreck" and made it a "shattered science," and they are right in "flinging aside once and for ever the mazy and preposterous assumptions of the Ricardian school." But in their attempts at construction they have erred as egregiously as those whose work they have pulled down, and "never were such broken victuals passed off upon any hungry mortals as Jevons passes off on us as the pure extract of human character and motive."

The weakness of all other economists except the Duke of Argyll consists, according to him, in their neglect of essential elements. Jevons attempted to apply the methods of mathematics to facts that cannot be quantitatively measured. Other economists have dealt with abstractions as if they were realities. The only true course is to take everything into consideration at once, and this is to be done by ascertaining the meaning of words in common use. These words, "constituting articulate speech, are the automatic record of the deepest of all truths." Thus the prolonged and still active pother over the concept "value" is all foolishness. Everybody knows what value is. The word is "familiarly used with that practical correctness of application which makes it fit perfectly into the facts of life." The economists make their difficulties for themselves by trying to frame definitions to fit into their "favorite theories and preconceptions." There are two kinds of technical language. The first, "and the only good," kind of technical language, is that employed by the Duke of Argyll, "which arises among workers whose minds are brought into touch with the unseen realities of nature, who instinctively recognize them, and who give to old words—generally by way of metaphor—some new and, often, some profound application." The other, the bad kind, "is that which is consciously and laboriously concocted by logicians and theorists of all kinds, whose minds are set upon some fragmentary conception about things, and who invent for these conceptions some jargon of their own."

There are several ways in which this iniquitous concoction operates. One is to lower a large conception down to the level of a small one, as when the idea of valuable things is "squeezed into such common words as 'goods,' or 'commodities,' or—worst of all—'utilities.'" Another way is to invent a new and pompous title for some one fact or some one small group of facts, as if they indicated a special law of economics, while in reality they are referable to one great general law applicable to the whole natural world. This offence is scandalously aggravated by the use of capital letters, and is well illustrated by the invention of the so-called agricultural law, "The Law of Diminishing Returns." In this way Ricardo's infamous theory of rent got a footing in economics, to the vexation of land-owners like the Duke of Argyll, who know perfectly well that the whole doctrine is pure moonshine. In fact, the whole science of economics "is infested with this pestilent vocabulary of phrases. They are a parasitical growth upon it, confounding and confusing the great facts and the great conceptions which are really vital, and which for the most part have found expression in the only vocabulary which is worth a jot—namely, that which has arisen spontaneously in the ordinary speech of men, reflecting and embodying their natural perceptions."

The only proper course to pursue in establishing the science of economics is obligingly communicated to the world by the Duke of Argyll. It is to take such specimens of "the noble coinage of common speech" as are deemed suitable for the purpose, and meditate upon them until their full meaning becomes clear. Value is thus disposed of in a paragraph, and we are assured that what meaning there is left in the word after this drastic analysis is not worth expressing. Wealth, however, receives a fuller treatment, and the definition of it is really the Duke of Argyll's chief achievement in this volume. It is unnecessary to urge that economists have often defined wealth, for, as this writer points out, all these definitions are characterized and vitiated by "neglected elements." Cliffe Leslie had a clever formula. Wealth, he said, comprised all things which are objects of human desire, limited in supply and valuable in exchange. This, however, is but hiding defects of thought under superficial neatness of expression, as appears if we ask ourselves, What are valuable things? The only true definition of wealth is as follows: It is (1) the Possession (with a large P), (2) in comparative abundance, (3) of things (4) which are legitimate objects of human desire, (5) not obtainable without some sacrifice or some exertion, (6) and which are accessible to men able, as well as anxious, to acquire them. Here we have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. There is nothing omitted nor anything omissible, and an apocalyptic denunciation is pronounced upon any man who shall presume to add unto or to take away from the words that are here written.

Having duly impressed upon his readers the perfection of this definition as a whole, the Duke proceeds, at prodigious length, to expatiate upon the merits of its parts. Possession, for example: is it not wonderful and almost incredible that this, the most absolutely essential of these six elementary conceptions, has been constantly omitted in defining wealth by economists both orthodox and heretical? Yet nothing can be clearer than that what is not possessed by anybody is not wealth. Moreover, by including the origin of Possession in economics we "add the whole wide field of History, embracing at least the elements of Religion, of Ethics, and of Law, to the older provinces of our inquiry." This may seem "like the throwing down of all containing walls, and the admitting of miscellaneous ideas which are irrelevant or even incongruous." But this is the fault of the subject. "If wealth does certainly include Possession, and if the mental attitude which constitutes the desire of acquisition be also included in it," then everything that bears upon human history must be included in economic science. And, finally, the propriety of including Possession in the definition of wealth is sanctioned by Divine authority, for we read in the Gospel of Luke that "a man's life consisteth not in (1) the abundance (2) of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things (3) which he possesseth." It might, indeed, be supposed that Possession was nine points of economic science as well as of the law, did we not find that the excellences of other features of this definition arouse almost equal enthusiasm on the part of its author as he successively reviews them.

We have neither space nor patience to follow further the divagations of this aristocratic but absurd author, who actually asserts of his puerile travesty of scientific method, "Never was there a more searching light thrown by any process so simple upon the direction, the methods, and the scope, of a great inquiry." He declares that the handling of this inquiry by others has been unphilosophical and unscientific, and in the same breath maintains that his analysis defines a "science" that comprehends not only the whole history and the whole nature of man, but the entire domain of external nature in all its relations to the human race. His method of economic investigation is an excellent illustration of what Bacon emphatically described as *mera palpatio*. Whether scientific definitions may be attained by meditating upon the meaning of words in common use we will not inquire; but it is certain that all such words are highly ambiguous. Nor can any one lay it down that the meanings that he arbitrarily assigns to such words are the true meanings or the only ones. The Duke of Argyll accuses economists of omitting to include Possession in the definition of wealth, but it is mere pedantry to urge such a criticism. As Mill observes, it is proper to say that a man fell from a ladder because his foot slipped, and not to insist on saying that he fell because of his weight or because of the attraction of gravitation or the constitution of the universe. The futility of such attempts at definition as that presented in this book appears if we insist upon supplying all the conditions. Clearly wealth is not "the Possession," but things possessed, and in any case the possession must be by some one. Of course, the Duke of Argyll would say that that is implied or understood, but then why does he denounce other people for presuming that their auditors are gifted with common sense? Again, what is meant by "comparative abundance"—what is the standard of comparison? And does the Duke of Argyll mean to exclude from wealth his own landed possessions, because they are not "accessible to men able to acquire them"? But it is idle to criticise a definition of wealth which is explicitly stated to include among "things" all conceptions definite enough to be referred to in human speech, including the idea of the Supreme Being. The virtues fit into this definition exactly, but it is a grotesque political economy that should treat of the production, distribution, and exchange of chastity and temperance.

The motive of the Duke of Argyll in laying such stress upon possession is, of course, to defend the case of great land-owners, which is at present in the United Kingdom, it must be allowed, somewhat precarious. Accordingly we find him marshalling evidence from all history to show that the individual ownership of land has been the bulwark of prosperity and the mainspring of progress. He therefore rests his case upon the conduciveness of this institution to the general welfare. But he goes further, and argues with much force and ingenuity that the management of great estates requires much labor on the part of landlords, thereby really resting their case upon the ground that they render a useful service to the community. He painfully attempts to entrench this position by denying the existence of rent in the economic sense, but, disregarding this futile endeavor, there remains a modicum of truth in his argument. Undoubtedly there have been many beneficent landlords, among whom the Duke of Argyll may be counted, but the question really at issue is whether it is practicable or desirable under modern democracy to maintain upon its former scale the relation of landlord and tenant. The law of inheritance is not essentially involved in possession, and when, as in the recent case of the Marquis of Ailesbury, the welfare of great numbers of tenants has been impaired by the misconduct of their landlord, it is now the recognized duty of the courts to extinguish possessory rights to land, even at the deplorable sacrifice of the strongest sentiments of local attachment.

PHRYGIAN ART.

History of Art in Phrygia, Lydia, Caria, and Lycia.—History of Art in Persia. From the French of Georges Perrot and Charles Chipiez. 2 vols. London: Chapman & Hall; New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1892.

ANOTHER instalment in two volumes of the great work of Perrot and Chipiez is before the world. In the first volume M. Perrot acts as our guide among the very ancient civilizations of Asia Minor, discussing in turn the art remains of the several peoples who inhabited the great peninsula before Hellenism became the leading influence of the ancient world. Of these peoples the Phrygians are easily of the first importance. It is true that they did not play so important a rôle in the history of the ancient world as did the Hittites, whose history and art were treated by Perrot in the volumes already noticed in these columns; but, after all, we know with certainty very little about the Hittites, whereas we do know "the house, parentage, and family of speech of the Phrygians." It seems clear, as was maintained by some of the ancient writers, that the Phrygians emigrated from Europe to Asia Minor. Thracian tribes began to appear in Asia Minor about the beginning of the twelfth century B. C. One of these tribes founded the State of Phrygia with Mt. Sipylus and the valley of the Hermus as centre. This was the epoch of Tantalus, Pelops, and Niobe. This Phrygia ceased to exist as a nation about the ninth or tenth century B. C., and a new empire was founded further eastward on the headwaters of the Sangarius River. Here the tribe came into conflict with the Amazons—that is, the warrior priestesses, or hierodules, of the Cappadocian Hittites. Herodotus even asserts that these Phrygians in their turn sent off colonists who settled on the headwaters of the Euphrates. Nor is there lack of modern scholars to support Herodotus, and maintain that the original of the word *elegy* is to be traced back through the Armenian to the Phrygian. This seems to us a hazardous hypothesis, but it is valuable because all traditions that bear upon the origin and ethnic affinities of the Phrygians help to determine the question of race, and point to the fact, already sufficiently clear from the scant evidence of inscriptions, that the Phrygians were of Indo-European stock, speaking a language so near akin to the Greek that they have been called "Eastern Greeks." This second Phrygian empire was the Phrygia of the Gordiuses and the Midases.

Phrygian inscriptions are not numerous, and have not been wholly deciphered as yet, though enough appears from them to enable us to classify the language with absolute certainty. The old alphabet used by the Phrygians at the time when the Hittites of Cappadocia were their only teachers was passed on to the Greeks, by whom it was improved. It was then readopted by the Phrygians, and employed on the tombs both of the Midas and the Ayazeen necropolises. This Phrygian alphabet is not one whit more ancient than that found in the oldest Greek inscriptions, and not only does it contain no trace of the Hittite hieroglyphs, but it is not derived from an old syllabary, as is the Cypriote, nor does it contain letters of Phœnician origin, as does the Lycian, and its transmission from Greece to Phrygia took place before the loss of the digamma—say about the close of the eighth century. This gives us a date beyond which the monuments of the Midas necropolis cannot go. Some of them are even younger than this.

The Phrygians have left no literature, and what is known about their language has been obtained from the few dozen inscriptions on the tombs or cenotaphic monuments of Phrygian kings or wealthy private persons. The Phrygian language began to be displaced by Greek when Alexander made Greek the language of government, but the common people continued to speak Phrygian until a late period, as is proved by bilingual inscriptions on tombs, where the Phrygian part of the inscription varies but little, and seems to be a malediction pronounced upon those who desecrate in any way the tomb. No more did Hellenic culture stamp out at once the religion, legends, and usages of the Phrygians, but in point of fact the Greeks were themselves influenced powerfully by their contact with the Phrygians, and both Greeks and Romans introduced the Phrygian religion, with all its horrible accessories, and gave it an honored place among their native and purer cults. As to the ultimate origin of this religion, it seems that the Phrygians, after having secured for themselves a large slice of the moribund Hittite empire, were themselves enslaved by those Hittite beliefs and rites which the Greeks afterwards knew only as Phrygian. This religion was an impure worship of the powers of nature, whose priestesses were devoted to wickedness in the name of religion. Originally "its festivals were a sacred drama, the subject of which was the eternal struggle between life and death, light and darkness, youth and decay." Its chief deity was the great goddess of Asia. She was the Great Mother, that is, Mother Earth, from whose bosom all life springs. The beautiful Sun-God was her son; he was at the same time her husband, whose premature death made so deep and lasting an impression upon the popular mind that the festival in memory of his death and resurrection was celebrated throughout the Orient with a fanatic zeal that bordered on frenzy and madness. Men often died in consequence of the cruel scourgings and self-inflicted mutilations, thus offering themselves a sacrifice to the great goddess, while others survived only to swell the number of eunuch priests, and in this capacity to lead the orgies held in honor of the goddess. The great goddess was worshipped under a variety of names among peoples of different nationalities. In Phrygia her name was Cybele or Cybebe, while her son-husband was Atys.

Now the music of the flute and elegiac verse had their origin in the frenzied orgies of this worship of Cybele. That the Phrygians were devoted to music is evinced by the fact that they first wrote in elegiac verse, and to accompany it invented the flute from the resonant reeds of Lake Aulokrene. We hear much of the conquest of Marsyas by Apollo, or, in other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words, of the conquest of the flute by the lyre. This fable means that the deep melodious tones of the lyre lulled the soul and were more pleasing to the Greeks than were the sharp, nervous, and martial notes of the flute. Now, while music in itself seems to have led captive the senses of the Greeks in a way which we can understand with difficulty, if at all, and was as much to be dreaded as inebriation, still it was the union of the intoxicating music of the flute and the plaintive, captivating poetry of elegiac verse—both of which came to Greece along with the worship of Matar Kubile—whose effects upon the soul were feared most, because they were thought to lead to self-indulgence and debauchery of the worst kind. When we speak of elegiac verse we recall the names of a line of worthies from Callinus to Solon, and yet the ideal educators of sober, thoughtful Greece (Plato and Aristotle), in banishing the flute from their ideal states, put the stamp of condemnation on all that was best in distinctively Phrygian civilization.

In his discussion of art in Phrygia, Perrot begins with the relics of the first Phrygian empire—in other words, with Sipylus and its monuments, the tomb of Tantalus at old Smyrna, and the rock-cut tombs near Magnesia-on-Hermus. But it is not until we reach his discussion of the ruins of the Midas necropolis that our attention is really riveted. We recognize at once as the striking feature of Phrygian art the fact that it is funereal in character, though some prefer to regard it as commemorative with semi-religious intent, rather than funereal. But in order to understand the nature of Phrygian architecture it is necessary first to grasp the peculiar configuration of the country, especially in the region of the Midas necropolis. The land is broken up into little valleys, separated by low hills that are crowned by a formation of volcanic rocks. These rocky ledges rise to a height of from 100 to 200 feet. Here and there they have crumbled at the base; gaps or passages have thus been formed, and the result is a wilderness of boulders of a yellowish conglomerate of varying firmness and density, though it is nowhere very hard. The excavations made by the natives in this rock, especially for the tombs of great personages, are not confined to one age, but in some instances go back to the time when iron was unknown, while others belong to a late period, when iron implements had reached such perfection that the mason might execute in stone designs requiring instruments of great precision. One would naturally expect to find excavated dwellings only in *woodless* regions, but wood abounds everywhere in Lycia and in the entire region of the Midas necropolis, though in the home proper of the cave-dwellers (*i. e.*, in the region between Indje-Su and Nev-Shehir and in the Soghanlü Deresi), wood is less abundant, being found only along the water-courses.

Now, the point to be most emphasized in regard to the ancient architecture of these regions is the fact that the carpentry work of wooden structures was imitated in stone, only what in wooden architecture was organic has become purely decorative in the stone architecture. Nor is this all, for the designs or patterns of rugs and embroideries were used in ancient Phrygia as decorations on the façades of rock-cut cenotaphic tombs. Thus, the façade of the tomb of Midas exhibits a handsome rug-pattern. No less than three millenniums separate us from the epoch we are discussing: once and again Phrygia has changed her masters, her religion, her language, her very inhabitants; and yet in the Phrygia of to-day we constantly meet with something that has come down across the ages to our own times. The Phrygians have been engaged in the manufacture of rugs from the time, in the dawn of history, when the tombs of Phrygian kings were draped with rugs carved in stone, for the so-called *Smyrna* rugs are made in Phrygia and Lydia, and, like *Smyrna* figs, get their name from the distributing centre from which they are shipped to foreign parts. The rug patterns on the Phrygian tombs exhibit lozenges, squares, crosses, meanders; but they are much simpler in design than the figured tapestries that issued from the looms of ancient Egypt and Assyria. The rug has always been a sacred article in the Orient, including ancient Greece: witness the reluctance of Agamemnon to place "the foot that trod down Troy" on royal rugs.

> "Strew not this purple that shall make each step
> An arrogance; such pomp beseems the gods,
> Not me. A mortal man to set his foot
> On these rich dyes? I hold such pride in fear,
> And bid thee honor me as man, not god."

From time immemorial in the Orient man might not enter the presence of God with unconcern, but must put the shoes from off his feet and pray on ground made holy by the rich and costly rug. Still, the sacredness of the rug arose not merely from its use in prayer; as drapery it was and is used in a semi-religious way—for instance, in the funereal or commemorative Turbes of Constantinople, Brussa, Khadmen, Kerbela, etc. This use as drapery is very ancient also, for do we not find it used in similar fashion to drape the mortuary couches of the tombs of Midas and the princes of his house?

Phrygian art was inspired by Hittite art, just as the latter had been inspired by Assyrian art; but the Phrygians proved themselves as inferior to their masters in matters of art as the Hittites had been inferior to the Assyrians; the focus of light was so distant that its rays lost much of their splendor in the course of their long journey from the Tigris to the Sangarius. Phrygian sculpture is insignificant; nothing that can be compared to the rock-cut sculptures of Pterium (Boghaz-kieui) has come down to us. The Phrygians do not seem to have advanced beyond flat relief, at least we know of only one statue in the round, if we may speak thus of the very poor ram of Kimbet, which is peculiar for the additional reason that it has wild goats depicted in flat relief on its sides. The function of this ram was the same as that of the lions or cherubim in Assyrian and Hittite palaces; he therefore had a mate, which may be existing still at Kimbet, though as yet no trace of the royal palace, at whose entrance he stood, has been found.

The Phrygian sculptor hesitated to reproduce the human form, though we find in the Midas necropolis at least one human figure which is clearly of ancient origin. There are several that belong to a late period, that is, they are not archaic, but archaistic in character, and belong to a period when the Phrygians, fully conscious of the interest that attached to their ancient myths, wished to glorify them in stone. Here the wise can see the influence of Greece. That the Phrygians, even of the Roman times, were proud of the traditions and myths relating to their past is shown by the very late coins that bear the name and effigy of Midas, and belong to the Augustan period certainly, or even to that of the Antonines.

The Ayazeen necropolis is still a mystery; its sculptures are much more recent than those of the Midas necropolis; they show distinct traces of Greek influence, although the inscription in honor of Matar Kubile is not one whit more modern than those on the tombs of Midas-Town. Phrygian art was not without merit, and the head of the lion on the broken tomb of the Ayazeen necropolis is the *chef d'œuvre* of Phrygian art, and can claim a certain amount of beauty and dignity. But Phrygian art was most deficient in variety, and, besides being limited to flat relief, it was also limited in its themes. Cleobulus or Homer does make mention of a Phrygian statue in bronze: χαλκέη παρθένος εἰμὶ, Μιδέω δ'ἐπὶ σήματι κεῖμαι ("I am a bronze maiden, on Midas's tomb I lie"); but nothing Phrygian in bronze or clay has come down to us, though that fact does not prove that people ignorant in this respect. The tomb of Midas is a narrow tongue of rock projecting from the Acropolis of Midas-Town much as does the Kynosoura of Salamis and Cyprus, and, though the top of the ledge is broken away to-day, there is no reason why the "bronze maiden" may not have stood in the good old time directly over the double volute that serves as acroterium to the façade of the tomb of Midas. We throw in the remark here that up to this moment the important monuments of the Midas and Ayazeen necropolis have not been photographed—a crying need.

The Ionic volute, which has given rise to such hot disputes in recent years, may be recognized in the acroteria that surmount the façades of tombs in the Midas necropolis, as well as in the columnar capping of the Yapuldak tomb. Thus we find one more link in the chain that stretches back through Cappadocia, Phœnicia, Syria, to Assyria. There are also traces of the proto-Doric supports in Phrygian architecture, though this must not be insisted upon too strongly. It seems probable that the wooden house of Phrygia, with its slanting snow-roof and gable-ends, furnished some of the elements of architecture to the Greeks. The pediment of the temple is but a gable, and is by no means the only element of wooden buildings to be found in the Greek temple.

Without the knowledge derived from the monuments of the Phrygian necropolis, we should not have a correct estimate of the influence exercised upon the Greeks by the peoples of Asia Minor, both as intermediaries and as creators. Above all in Phrygia we can trace the influence Greece began to exercise over nations which had first instructed her. The earliest traces of this returning wave are found in the alphabet on the tombs about the close of the eighth century B. C. The alphabet was followed by an influx of Grecian ideas relative to architecture and sculpture.

As is natural, more space is given by Perrot to Phrygia than to Lydia, Caria, and Lycia, though the art of each of these countries is treated with Perrot's wonted skill and acumen. The entire second volume is devoted to the History of Art in Persia. The splendid volume represents the present status of our knowledge on Persian art down to the time of going to press. Perrot has now reached the turn in the road that leads to Greece, and the appearance of the first volume (in French, as yet) of the History of Greek Art is just announced. This volume treats of the art of Mycenæ. It collects and groups for the first time all the scattered material. We rejoice most heartily at the appearance of the book, and we look forward with eager anticipation to the time when the whole stupendous work will have been completed. May it be near at hand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Life and Times of C. G. Memminger. By Henry D. Capers, A.M. Charleston: Isaac Hammond. 1893.

THE more clearly we come to understand the facts about the attempted secession of the Southern States, the more we are amazed at the delusions under which the Southerners were suffering with respect to their own position, the temper and resources of the North, and the attitude which foreign nations would probably assume towards their enterprise. They were in the position of men who enter upon an undertaking under a storm of feeling, without being sure of their grievance, and without counting the cost or collecting the ways and means. In the statement of reasons for secession by South Carolina, which, as we learn from this book, was prepared by Mr. Memminger, the most important allegation was: "On the 4th of March next this [Republican] party will take possession of the Government. It has announced that the South shall be excluded from the common territory, that the judicial tribunals shall be made sectional, and that a war must be waged against slavery until it shall cease throughout the United States. The guarantees of the Constitution will then no longer exist. The equal rights of the States will be lost. The slaveholding States will no longer have the power of self-government or self-protection, and the Federal Government will have become their enemy." The wrong was, therefore, apprehended in the future, and was inferred from a statement of facts which was distorted by passion. President Lincoln, in his inaugural, answered this allegation almost directly: "Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that, by the accession of a Republican Administration, their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection." The Southerners paid a frightful penalty for their delusion—a penalty so severe that before it was complete it extorted pity and sympathy from their enemies. They tell us now—some of them—that they repent of nothing and regret nothing. Probably it is not in human nature that they should, but when we say that we think they have something to regret, we refer to these unfounded and unjustifiable mistakes which cost us all so much.

The author of the book before us is probably about sixty years of age. He was Chief Clerk in the Confederate Treasury under the Provisional Government. His ideas are still those of 1860, although they have lost their sharpness. His dialect and rhetoric are still those which were distinctively Southern before the war, although they are somewhat chastened. The present generation of Southerners, if we may judge by the newspapers of the large cities, are as hard-headed as most other people, and it is a reminder of old times to meet once more with the old disposition to infuse an element of poetry into things. Still, this disposition is so kept in check in this book that it does not go beyond what may be pardoned in a man brought up in the old Southern notions. He is one of the old-fashioned Southerners in whose memory and imagination Dixie as it was before the war floats as a paradise such as was never enjoyed elsewhere by mortals, and which was spoiled by fanatics and abolitionists. This puts him in full sympathy with his subject, whom he regards as a hero. He reveres him as a man and Christian, and admires him as a lawyer, statesman, and financier, fit to rank in manners and attainments with the best of the old Southern public men.

The old South enjoyed economic advantages which have perhaps never been equalled. These advantages produced an opulent society. It was their opulence which made the best of the men generous, brave, and honorable, and the women beautiful and gracious. These are the features on which the admirers of the old South, like our author, never tire of dwelling, and it is in this class that he puts Mr. Memminger. The opulence made the worst of the Southerners quixotic, proud, arrogant, and narrow-minded. In this book the insubordination and recklessness of the old Southern character are repeatedly recognized and blamed. The faults and the virtues of the old Southern character may well be repeated anywhere, at any time, by a people who enjoy the easy possession of great economic advantages and resulting wealth.

Memminger was born in Germany, but was brought to South Carolina when three years old, and, being left an orphan, was reared in an orphan asylum at Charleston. He found noble friends, who gave him the best chances of education, and became a successful lawyer. He was in the South Carolina Legislature almost continuously during the thirty years before the war. In 1832 and 1852 he was a conservative as to secession, although not opposed to it. In the latter year he exposed, with simple common sense, the headlong folly of the party which proposed that South Carolina should secede at once and alone. He also urged that, if the State was to secede, measures should be taken to put it in a state of defence. In 1859 he was sent as agent of South Carolina to Virginia. He read an address to the Virginia Legislature, in which he summed up the whole history of Southern grievances. It is a long document, and is given in full in this book.

We are disappointed that we do not learn more from Mr. Capers about the Confederate finances. The history of them does not occupy its proportionate space, although it was solely in connection with them that Mr. Memminger was a man of public importance. It is shown, however, that the Confederates never had any financial system. It was in vain that Memminger insisted on taxation as the basis of the schemes which he proposed. The Congress adopted all but the taxes, which left the schemes mere paper-money delusions. There was but one war tax ever laid, and only a part of that was collected. When the causes of the success of the North over the South come to be specified, this fact deserves a place among the first. The Southerners made incredible sacrifices for the cause which they had undertaken. They spent their blood with a courage which nobody has ever questioned, and they came out of the war completely impoverished, but they did not pay taxes for their independence as the Northerners did to maintain the Union. In the North we know that the statesmen were afraid to lay taxes until public opinion forced them to do it. In the South, with such a disposition to make sacrifices, would not the people have paid taxes if the statesmen had had the courage to lay them?

Mr. Memminger resigned in 1864 because the Congress would not support his propositions, and because he could not carry on the Treasury under their plan. He never won any glory as a financier. On the contrary, he incurred blame, and neither in the Confederacy nor outside of it has his reputation been great. His biography shows that he deserves credit for ideas which were correct, and a policy which would have been far wiser than the one which was adopted. Another inference from the story seems also valuable: the North and South entered upon the war with substantially the same knowledge and experience in public finance. We are accustomed to criticise unfavorably the financial policy of our own statesmen during the war, but the Confederate history shows that it might have been much worse. If it were not for the Legal Tender Act, the Northern finance would, by comparison, seem excellent.

Scientific Correspondence of Joseph Priestley. Ninety-seven Letters. Together with an Appendix. I. The Likenesses of Priestley in Oil, Ink, Marble, and Metal. II. The Lunar Society of Birmingham. III. Inventory of Priestley's Laboratory in 1791. Edited, with copious Biographical, Bibliographical, and Explanatory Notes, by Henry Carrington Bolton. New York: Privately printed. 1892.

ALTHOUGH Rutt's 'Life and Correspondence of Joseph Priestley' (1832) contains several hundred of Priestley's letters, those which are embraced in the volume before us are, with few exceptions, now published for the first time. Rutt's neglect of these illustrations of Priestley's scientific work appears to have been due to his belief that the theological writings constituted Priestley's most enduring and important work. At the distance of a hundred years, however, from the scene of his restless and many-sided activity, the theologian is of far less interest than the discoverer of oxygen, the "Father of Pneumatic Chemistry," who did so much by his mistakes as well as by his successes to lay the foundations of chemical science.

Of the ninety-two letters from Priestley's hand which are here given, thirty-six are addressed to Josiah Wedgwood and five to his son Thomas, nine to Capt. James Keir, nine to Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia, seven to Sir Joseph Banks, President of the Royal Society, six to Dr. William Withering, four to James Watt. Among those not enumerated is one to Benjamin Franklin and one to Lavoisier. The first letter is dated from Calne, March 26, 1780, shortly before Priestley's settlement in Birmingham. He was then forty-seven years old, and through his theological writings and chemical discoveries had an established reputation at home and abroad.

Josiah Wedgwood, to whom a majority of the letters are addressed, took, as is well known, a lively and generous interest in Priestley's experimental work, supplying him liberally with earthen retorts and tubes from his famous pottery, and contributing regularly to the fund in aid of his researches and publications. To this sympathetic friend Priestley writes frequently for supplies of his wares, and communicates the results of his experiments and his first impressions in regard to their interpretation in the frankest and most natural manner. It is interesting to be thus admitted to his laboratory and to watch him as he works and talks. The reader gains an instructive insight into the difficulties of chemical investigation in those days of imperfect and inadequate apparatus, scant knowledge, and confused theory. The porosity of his earthenware retorts leads Priestley at one time sadly astray. In a letter of December 8, 1782, he announces that he has "succeeded in converting pure *water* into *permanent* air by previously combining it with quicklime, and then subjecting it to a strong heat." This falla-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cious conclusion was corrected only after much experimental labor and loss of time. On the 8th of January following he writes, "It is remarkable that this experiment does not succeed in a glass retort"; but it is not till the 29th of April, in a letter to James Watt, that we find him convinced that the air which he obtained is that which has passed through the walls of his retort.

It is, indeed, very clear from his letters on this subject and others that in Priestley power of observation was superior to that of interpretation. He himself says, in a letter to Wedgwood (No. 20), "I have a tolerably good habit of circumspection with regard to *facts;* but as to conclusions from them, I am not apt to be very confident." As is well known, he strenuously maintained and defended the theory of Phlogiston to the end of his life, in spite of the perfectly clear and direct proof against it wrought out by Lavoisier and published in 1789. His last chemical essay, published at Northumberland in 1803, is entitled "The Doctrine of Phlogiston Established and that of the Composition of Water Refuted." Traces of his struggle for Phlogiston appear in some of the later letters. Thus in No. 78, to Dr. Withering, he writes: "I have already made some experiments relating to the *doctrine of phlogiston*, and when I have made a few more shall probably write something on the subject. I am surprised at the confidence with which the French chemists write." In No. 80, to the same: "I think with you that their [the French philosophers'] *charbon* or *hydrogene* will prove to be nothing more than another name for *phlogiston*." And again in No. 89, to the same: "I think I shall prove pretty decisively that what I have called the *phlogistication* of air is really so, and not the mere absorption of the pure part of it, as the French chymists suppose."

The obsolete nomenclature, which Priestley of course employs, in many cases "nearly smothers his meaning," as Dr. Bolton aptly remarks in a note to No. 43; while Priestley and his fellow-adherents of Phlogiston find the new nomenclature proposed by Lavoisier and his friends, and already in common use on the Continent, "poetical," and Capt. Keir wishes that "M. Berthollet and his associates would relate their facts in plain prose, that all men might understand them" (No. 52, Keir to Priestley). In the same letter Keir remarks: "There are wonderful resources in the dispute about phlogiston, by which either party can evade, so that I am less sanguine than you are in my hopes of seeing it terminated."

No less readable than these letters is the account given by Dr. Bolton in the appendix of the "Lunar Society, or The Festive Philosophers of Birmingham One Hundred Years Ago." The Lunar Society was an informal club of scientific men which was founded about 1766 by Matthew Boulton, Dr. Erasmus Darwin, and their friends, and flourished some forty years. The members dined at each other's houses once a month "on the Monday nearest to the full moon, 'in order,' says Priestley, 'to have the benefit of its light in returning home.' Hence the name." Priestley joined this genial band of philosophers on coming to Birmingham in 1780, and, after his forced removal, never ceased to "regret the loss of the *Lunar Society*, where I spent so many happy hours, and for which I found no substitute even in London" (Letter No. 89).

After reading this well-edited volume and the admirable sketch of the Lunar Society, we find ourselves hoping that Dr. Bolton will, before long, crown his labors in this field by giving us an adequate portrait of Priestley, the scientific investigator.

The Columbus Gallery: The Discoverer of the New World as represented in portraits, monuments, statues, medals and paintings. By Néstor Ponce de León. New York. 1893.

THE author-publisher has here given the completest account yet made of the almost innumerable representations of Columbus, both authentic (?), pseudo-authentic, forgeries, and professed fantasies, and in every department of art, with ample graphic reproductions. His views are conservative, and he endeavors to show the relations, more or less remote, which he holds to exist between various alleged originals and the likeness of the discoverer which Giovio is known to have had in his gallery on Lake Como—the only nearly contemporary picture of which we have any trustworthy record. He links with this the Giovio woodcut and the Florence canvas, and no others, making a mass of negative testimony which rejects every other claimant as not proven.

The cut which the author gives of the Giovio picture published in 1575 is a facsimile; but he is unfortunate in what he says of the picture in the Uffizi Gallery. He holds that the painter of it copied, some time between 1552 and 1567, the lost Como original, softening the expression, which is perhaps better preserved in the somewhat rude but vigorous woodcut. The copy of this Florence picture, which was made for Thomas Jefferson and is now owned by the Massachusetts Historical Society, he contends was still further softened in the lineaments by the copier. After these statements he gives a cut purporting to be "a copy of the portrait in the Uffizi Gallery." It is in fact no such thing, but a reduced process-reproduction of the Jefferson picture, made without acknowledgment from the woodcut given in Winsor's 'America'; hence a conflict in text and cut.

While one may acknowledge that the Giovio likeness, if known, would be worth considering in the study of the personal appearance of Columbus, it is an entirely gratuitous assumption to say that Giovio "would not hesitate to acquire at any price some trustworthy portrait of the Admiral taken from life." If Giovio carried into the formation of his gallery the principles of untruth which he preferred to practise in other relations of life, he could hardly have been a less compliant judge of authenticity than the various owners of alleged portraits of Columbus known to our day and generation. If we had indisputable evidence that any one of the numerous canvases, each pretending to be the original Como likeness, was to be acknowledged as such, there would still be the unfortunate fact that we cannot get behind the evidence of such a collector as Giovio himself. When Mr. Ponce de León says of this maker of the gallery in the Como villa, that he was "a man without conscience or principle, mendacious; a flatterer, calumniator, and intriguer," with a venal pen, which never hesitated to write "in favor of the highest bidder," and that he was consequently "absolutely discredited as a historian," he might have at least considered how essential the elements of truth are in a collector before he entered upon the asseveration which we have already quoted. With but a slender rill to follow back to the pictorial source of our knowledge of the person of Columbus, and with such pollution at the fountain, there is small chance of the cautious critic being satisfied with the evidence of even the Giovio woodcut and the Uffizi portrait.

The mass of material which our author has diligently sought and arranged respecting the imaginative delineations of the great Admiral is curious and interesting, but it is not matter to be judged historically.

Mr. Ponce de León has also published an oblong pamphlet on 'The Caravels of Columbus,' which he says is "compiled from original documents," though we find him in it citing the language of a recent book without the usual quotation-marks. The chief value of the little publication is the putting into English the details of the official studies made for the Spanish Government in preparation for the construction of the caravels which are now in our own waters. The foremost of these Spanish investigators has been a distinguished officer of the Spanish Navy, Cesareo Fernandez-Duro, whose researches have already been laid before the English reader by Mr. Clements R. Markham in the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society (September, 1892); and Mr. Markham, to say nothing of other recent investigators, could have instructed Mr. Ponce de León in the matter of the crews of the ships. When the latter speaks of the speed of these ships of Columbus as being "equal to that of sailing ships of our day," basing his judgment on the log of Columbus, he should have told us what he considered the mile and league of Columbus to have been—in estimating which there is much difference of opinion. He should also remember that the abridgment which we have of Columbus's log was made by Las Casas, a land-lubber, who, there is some ground for supposing, curiously at times confounded mile and league, inasmuch as a substitution of one word for the other alone renders certain statements of the log defensible.

Les Temps Difficiles. Par J. L. Forain. Paris: G. Charpentier et E. Fasquelle.

Album de Forain. Paris: H. Simonis Empis.

THE Panama scandals have furnished the French caricaturists with material in infinite measure. Even Louis Philippe was not so inexhaustible a butt for ridicule as the men who have, in this disgraceful affair, brought dishonor upon France. Caran d'Ache, in his 'Carnet de Chèques,' has turned them to most artistic account; and now Forain has followed his lead in 'Les Temps Difficiles (Panama).' The drawings in this volume are all in pen and ink and almost in pure outline. They have the distinction that marks, as a rule, Forain's work, and they are characterized by the same power of expressing form and action by the simplest possible means. Only the most accomplished draughtsman could, as he does, in a few masterly lines, suggest with equal success the elderly bourgeoise in her morning wrapper, the elegant *mondaine* in evening gown, the slim, graceful maiden who, in liberty cap, personifies France; or, on the other hand, the fat Jew financier, the *garçon*, the flunkey. But the volume is lacking in the humor which should be its only excuse. One or two good points are made: The blind man's dog left alone on the Pont des Arts because his master has been had up before the Commission; France bidding Truth remain at the bottom of her well because it is too cold for her to venture out; the jailer exhibiting the Minister in his cell to the British tourists. It is amusing, too, to find Forain perpetuating the old French idea of the true British type—a thin, angular woman with hideous projecting teeth —Guy de Maupassant's Miss Harriet exag-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gerated. But, as a whole, the book has not the uncontrollable fun, the irrepressible good spirits, the irresistible humor of Caran d'Ache's 'Chèques.' And unless the laugh be spontaneous, Panama is far too grim a subject for the caricaturist.

The truth is, that it is not in the world of politics or of finance that Forain is at home. His province is the *demi-monde*, the *Bohème* of the modern Mürger, the Paris of Zola and the Naturalists. And it is to this Paris he returns in the new 'Album de Forain,' just published by Simonis Empis. It is really no less grim, no less tragic a subject than Panama. "La Forêt de Paris" Daudet, in his Introduction, says the Album should be called, for the impression it left with him was of a Paris, like the Dantesque forest, scarcely less bitter than death. But here Forain's gayety is not forced; he laughs, not to order, not to be "up to date," but because he is honestly amused. It is likely enough that the humorous side of his scenes and situations will not appeal to the average Anglo-Saxon as it does to the average Frenchman. The former may, with Daudet, see not only the fun but the tragedy of it all. But whether one laughs or one weeps, there is no gainsaying the spontaneity and cleverness of Forain's work. The knowledge, the command of technique with which the figures are put in, always with the same marvellous simplicity, could hardly be surpassed, nor the character of each type more perfectly rendered. It might be objected, however, that the Album is too much of a repetition of 'La Comédie Parisienne'; in one or two cases, not only the same subjects but the same drawings seem to have been used, the only difference being in their reproduction on a larger scale.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adeney, W. F. Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. [The Expositor's Bible.] Armstrong. $1.50.
Aho, Jubani. Squire Hellman, and Other Stories. Cassell. 50 cents.
Bailey, Mrs. John. Physical Culture. The Author.
Beach, C. F. Commentaries on the Law of Public Corporations. 2 vols. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co.
Beaumarchais, Pierre A. C. de. Le Barbier de Séville. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 25 cents.
Cornwallis, Kinahan. The Conquest of Mexico and Peru prefaced by the Discovery of the Pacific: An Historical Narrative Poem. The *Daily Investigator*. $1.
De Leon, T. C. John Holden, Unionist. St. Paul: Price-McGill Co.
Dumas, A. Joseph Balsamo. M. J. Ivers & Co. 25 cents.
Edmunds, A. J. English and American Poems. Philadelphia: Chambers Printing House. $1.
Finck, H. T. Wagner and his Works: The Story of his Life. With Critical Comments. 2 vols. Scribners. $4.
Greg, R. P. Comparative Philology of the Old and New Worlds in Relation to Archaic Speech. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
Hulme, F. E. The Birth and Development of Ornament. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. $1.25.
Isaacs, Prof. A. S. Stories from the Rabbis. C. L. Webster & Co. $1.25.
Kayser, Prof. E. Text-Book of Comparative Geology. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. $4.50.
Kunhardt, C. P. Ropes, their Knots and Splices. *Forest and Stream* Publishing Co. 50 cents.
Lytton, the Earl of. King Poppy. Longmans, Green & Co. $3.
McCarthy, Justin. The Dictator: A Novel of Politics and Society. Harpers.
Owen, John. The Skeptics of the Italian Renaissance. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. $3.50.
Prentiss, Caroline E. Fleeting Thoughts. Putnams. $1.
Rathbone, St. George. Major Matheson of Kentucky. St. Paul: Price-McGill Co. 50 cents.
Renouvier, Ch. Victor Hugo le Poète. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.
Stanley, H. M. Slavery and the Slave Trade in Africa. Harpers. 50 cents.
St. Aubyn, Alan. The Master of St. Benedict's. Rand, McNally & Co.
Steell, Willis. The Death of the Discoverer. Hillier, Murray & Co.
Swanwick, Anna. Poets the Interpreters of their Age. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Symonds, J. A. The Life of Michelangelo Buonarroti. 2 vols. 2d ed. Scribners. $7.50.
Taussig, Prof. F. W. The Silver Situation in the United States. Putnams. 75 cents.
The Divinity of Jesus Christ. Reprinted from the *Andover Review*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.
Van Rensselaer, Mrs. Schuyler. Art Out-of-Doors: Hints on Good Taste in Gardening. Scribners. $1.50.
Wagner, Capt. A. L. The Service of Security and Information. Washington: J. J. Chapman.
Wagner, Charles. Youth. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.25.
Walker, T. A. The Science of International Law. Cambridge: University Press: New York: Macmillan. $4.50.

AMERICAN SCIENCE SERIES.

BARKER'S PHYSICS.	Advanced course.
REMSEN'S CHEMISTRY.	3 courses.
PACKARD'S ZÖOLOGY.	3 courses.
MARTIN'S HUMAN BODY.	3 courses.
WALKER'S POLITICAL ECONOMY.	3 courses.
NEWCOMB & HOLDEN'S ASTRONOMY.	2 courses.
BESSEY'S BOTANY.	2 courses.
JAMES'S PSYCHOLOGY.	2 courses.
SEDGWICK & WILSON'S BIOLOGY.	

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

GREELEY ON LINCOLN.

With Mr. Greeley's Letters to Charles A. Dana and a Lady Friend, to which are added Reminiscences of Horace Greeley.

Edited by JOEL BENTON.

With a photo-sculpture portrait of Mr. Greeley, and a facsimile of a part of his MS.

12MO, CLOTH..... $1.25

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of the price, by

The Baker & Taylor Co.,

740 and 742 Broadway, New York.

SCHOLASTIC. — *Opening for Boys' or* Girls' Boarding School in the country. Some capital required. Climate perfect for consumptives. For particulars address BROWN BROS., Box 723, Austin, Tex.

HATCHARDS.

This is the favorite BOOKSTORE, and for 100 years the resort of the smartest people in London. It is visited and patronized by all who love books. London is the great market for books, and all the best as well as the cheapest editions can be had by writing to us. Special collections formed, and fuller information supplied than from any other house. Books both old and new, and relating to any subject, can readily be supplied at very moderate prices.

Agents for Clubs, Libraries, and all private Collectors.

187 PICCADILLY, LONDON W.

The New York Bureau of Revision.

FOR AUTHORS: The skilled revision, the unbiased and competent criticism of prose and verse; *advice as to publication; proof-reading.* FOR PUBLISHERS: The compilation of first-class works of reference. Established 1880; unique in position and success; endorsed by our leading writers. Address DR. TITUS M. COAN, 70 5th Ave., New York.

PROOF-REVISING AND INDEXING. —G. E. BIVER, 835 N. 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

YALE MIXTURE

The choicest Smoking Tobacco experience can produce or that money can buy. MARBURG BROS.

CROSBY'S VITALIZED PHOSPHITES.

From the nerve-feeding principle of the ox brain and wheat germ.

Is an essential Food to the Brain and Nerves. It contains nothing injurious. Formula on each label.

For relief of brain fatigue, nervous debility, dyspepsia, sleeplessness, and night sweats, it is invaluable.

For thirty years used by thousands of brain-workers with such success as a *curative* that now many take it before great mental effort as a *preventive* of mental and physical exhaustion.

This vital nutriment supplies elements to brain and nerves, the loss of which is often the only cause of disease.

Indorsed by leading physicians. Descriptive pamphlet free. Druggists, or by mail, $1. Prepared only by the Accept no substitute. Each label has our signature.

F. Crosby Co.,

56 West 25th St., New York.

A Tonic

For Brain-Workers, the Weak and Debilitated.

Horsford's Acid Phosphate

is without exception the Best Remedy for relieving Mental and Nervous Exhaustion; and where the system has become debilitated by disease, it acts as a general tonic and vitalizer, affording sustenance to both brain and body.

Dr. J. C. Wilson, Philadelphia, Pa., says: "I have used it as a general tonic, and in particular in the debility and dyspepsia of overworked men, with satisfactory results."

Descriptive Pamphlet free.

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

THE SCIENCE OF NUTRITION.

By EDWARD ATKINSON, LL.D., Ph.D., and The Art of Cooking in the Aladdin Oven,

With Directions and many Recipes. Cloth, 75 cents; leatherette, 50 cents.

DAMRELL & UPHAM, BOSTON PUBLISHERS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED